DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 217 EA 025 852

AUTHOR	Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE	Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	RP91002003
NOTE	111p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 211 East 7th Street, Austin, TX 78701.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; Models; *Organizational Theories; Principals; School Effectiveness; *School Restructuring; Strategic Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Facilitative Leadership

ABSTRACT

Schools must change to meet the demands of an increasingly diverse population of children, many of whom are at risk of leaving school unprepared for a productive adult life. Research-based evidence indicates that the process of change has been a neglected area in policy implementation. The key factor is "facilitative leadership," provided by individuals who assume responsibility to guide and support the work of instituting policies and practices to meet the needs of all children, most particularly those at risk. Leaders' strategies, operationalized by their actions and behaviors, remain consistent, as revealed by the research conducted at widely varying school sites. This review and synthesis of the literature begins with a brief history of approaches to change and the emergence of the need for change facilitation. The second section explores the actions of successful school leaders in the past decade and indicates how these leaders attended to and contributed significantly to successful change. A third section examines how leaders are currently addressing systemic change or restructuring, as it is called in schools. (Contains 157 references and 5 figures.) (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 217

EA

Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change

EA 025 852

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change

Shirley M. Hord
1992

Southwest Educational
Development Laboratory
211 E. Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701
512/476-6861

Copyright, 1992

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education under contract number RP91002003. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Approaches to Change 5

- Early Models 5
  - Empirical-rational/technological/fix the parts 7
  - Power-coercive/political/fix the people and the parts 8
  - Normative-re-educative/cultural/fix the school 10
- Reflecting about These Approaches to Change 15
- Emerging Attention to Facilitation 15
  - Linkage 16
  - Rand Change Agent Study 17
  - Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) 20
- Concluding This Section 20

Leaders' Change-Facilitating Actions 21

- Leadership vs. Management 21
- The Need for Leaders 23
- The Leaders 25
  - Principals 25
  - Leadership teams 27
  - Superintendents 28
- A Six-Component Framework 29
  - Creating an Atmosphere and Culture for Change 31
  - Developing and Communicating the Vision 33
  - Planning and Providing Resources 37
  - Providing Training and Development 40
  - Monitoring and Checking Progress 41
  - Continuing to Give Assistance 44
- Tools and Techniques for Leaders 46
  - Tools for Change Facilitators 47
  - Principles of Change Facilitation 48
- A Few More Words about Facilitation 49
- Concluding This Section 51

Leadership for Restructuring or Systemic Change 53

Negative Notes 54
On a Positive Note 56
Outcomes for Students 57
Outcome-Driven Restructuring 59
Again, The Need for Leaders 61
Transformational Leadership: From Push to Pull 65
Permission for Passion 67
To Foster Restructuring 71
New Roles for Old 79
Concluding This Section 85

In Conclusion 87

Bibliography 91

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Central Focus of the Models 6

Figure 2. Three Generations of Approaches to Change 7

Figure 3. Early Studies of Change 12

Figure 4. Classifications of Interventions 30

Figure 5. Thinking About Improving Schools 59

Acknowledgements

This manuscript has benefited from the editing expertise of Jan McInroy, and from the review and critique of colleagues interested and concerned about educational change and improvement: George Baker, Martha Boethel, Victoria Boyd, Wes Hoover, Deborah Jolly, Sandra Neubert, Bonnie Page, Bill Rutherford, Richard Tompkins, and Carolyn Wood. Their generous feedback is greatly appreciated; however, the author alone assumes responsibility for the final document.

Persons key to the preparation of the manuscript for publication were Rosalind Alexander-Kasparik for her artistic consultation, and Lori Kitchens. Lori's patience was endless; her skills at converting scribbles and scrawls into sense-making text were remarkable.

I am indebted to all.

SMH, 1992

Introduction

All citizens — not only educators but parents, corporate and other community members, banking and foundation staffs, and politicians — have been urged to become involved in America's schools, as schools address the needs of an increasingly diverse population of children. Large percentages of these children, for a variety of reasons, are at risk of leaving school unprepared for a productive adult life. Schools must change to meet these new demands, and educational leadership will be required as never before. Clearly, an understanding of leadership for change is of the utmost importance to the profession and the public alike.

This paper challenges the assumption that invoking policy mandates alone, albeit well intended and directed toward increasing success for all students, is enough to realize such outcomes as increased student success. Cuban (1988) asserts that educational reform has failed because of lack of attention to implementation; this paper presents research-based evidence that the *process* of change has been a neglected area in policy implementation and that time and energy need to be devoted to it. The key factor in addressing this issue is *facilitative leadership*, provided by individuals in a variety of positions both within and outside the school and the district, who assume responsibility to guide and support the important work of instituting policies and practices to meet the needs of

Cuban (1988) asserts that educational reform has failed because of lack of attention to implementation.

Therefore, this paper addresses the strategies that such leaders use in efforts to facilitate implementation of school change.

Two other reviews, by Méndez-Morse (1992) and Boyd (1992), provide insights relative to leader characteristics and contextual variables especially significant in addressing school change for the benefit of at-risk students.

all children, most particularly those at risk. Therefore, this paper addresses the strategies that such leaders use in efforts to facilitate implementation of school change.

This monograph is one of three in a series of literature reviews focusing on topics that influence school change. Two other reviews, by Méndez-Morse (1992) and Boyd (1992), provide insights relative to leader characteristics and contextual variables especially significant in addressing school change for the benefit of at-risk students. Méndez-Morse reports that there are six characteristics that are common in leaders of educational change. These include "having vision, believing that schools are for learning, valuing human resources, being a skilled communicator and listener, acting proactively, and taking risks" (1992, in press). The paper reports about leaders' professional experiences as well.

Boyd maintains that leaders need special understanding of the contextual factors that impinge on at-risk students, on staff, and on their school in order to plan change with staff, parents, and community. Boyd enumerates environmental and cultural factors that constitute the school's context. Without accurate perceptions about the environmental and cultural factors that interact with students and staff in at-risk settings, successful change in these sites may not result.

Whether in sites of high ethnic/minority populations, in settings of language-deficient students, in schools where children come from poverty level, one-parent families — or from middle-class suburbia — the *strategies* that leaders use to bring about

change are generic. School leaders may shape their actions and behaviors to their own personal characteristics and belief systems, and deliver them in ways that account for the cultural and environmental factors of the staff, school, and community. But their strategies, operationalized by their actions and behaviors, remain consistent, as revealed by the research conducted at widely varying school sites.

But their strategies, operationalized by their actions and behaviors, remain consistent, as revealed by the research conducted at widely varying school sites.

For example, a leader in an economically disadvantaged school may introduce the idea of school change in a way different from the approach of the leader who introduces improvement to an economically comfortable school with a high number of merit scholars. But in either case, a key strategy for initiating change is development of a vision of improved effectiveness.

This review and synthesis of the literature begins with a brief history of approaches to change and the emergence of the need for change facilitation. The second section explores the actions of successful school leaders in the past decade and indicates how these leaders attended to and contributed significantly to successful change. A third section examines how leaders are currently addressing systemic change or "restructuring," as it is popularly called in schools.

The change research does little to differentiate the strategies that leaders use in efforts for populations of at-risk children as opposed to strategies for those not at risk. The important issue, of course, is to understand the requirements for effectively guiding change in behalf of *all* children.

Approaches to Change

In a sense, U.S. schools are currently locked in a war against ignorance and apathy. Whether we win or lose will depend, in large part, on leadership.

— Deal, 1990, p. vii

Many writers have made contributions to the change literature. One still recognized is Lewin, who in 1936 conceptualized the stages of change as "unfreezing," "change" or intervention, and "refreezing." Cited also and still appreciated is Rodgers (1971), who reported five categories of change adopters, providing a series of descriptions of people who adopt change early, not so early, and late. Prominent also in the history of change process models are those categorized by Chin and Benne (1969) and Havelock (1971).

Early Models

Chin and Benne (1969) and Havelock (1971) each articulated three types of models, and the two sets shared some overlapping conceptualizations. Some of the models had a primary focus on innovation and organization, while others centered on the individual, with more frequent attention to innovation and organization, as can be seen in Figure 1. Students of organizational change and the change process will

Chin and Benne (1969) and Havelock (1971) each articulated three types of models, and the two sets shared some overlapping conceptualizations.

almost always point to Getzels and Guba (1957) as the first to distinguish between *nomothetic elements*, or organizational expectations to reach goals, and *idiographic elements*, or needs of individuals who achieve the goals. Theirs was an early conceptualization that identified the individual as a factor to be considered (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). It was some decades after Getzels and Guba's specification that real attention was paid to the individual in organizational change, as we shall see.

Theirs was an early conceptualization that identified the individual as a factor to be considered (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Figure 1. Central Focus of the Models

	Focus on Innovation and Organization	Focus on Individual
Chin & Benne (1969)		
Empirical-rational	X	
Normative-re-educative		X
Power-coercive	X	
Havelock (1971)		
Social interaction	X	
Research, development, diffusion	X	
Problem solver		X

Because there are similarities in the Havelock and Chin/Benne models, and to simplify the discussion that follows, only Chin and Benne's categories will be described. Further, because it is instructive in understanding the

evolution of approaches to change, two subsequent generations of labels and applications for Chin and Benne's categories, by House and by Sashkin and Egermeier, will be included. The association between Chin and Benne's three categories and the three authors is portrayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2.
Three Generations of Approaches to Change

Chin & Benne (1969)	House (1981)	Sashkin & Egermeier (1992)
Empirical-rational	Technological	Fix the parts
Power-coercive	Political	Fix the people
Normative-re-educative	Cultural	Fix the school

Empirical-rational/technological/fix the parts. The basic assumption underlying the empirical-rational model is that individuals are rational and will follow their rational self-interest. Thus, if a "good" change is suggested, people of good intention will adopt the change. This approach "posits that change is created by the dissemination of innovative techniques" (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992, p. 1). A primary strategy of this model is the dissemination of knowledge gained from research. One example of agencies and systems used for the development and diffusion of such research

Thus, if a "good" change is suggested, people of good intention will adopt the change.

results are agricultural extension systems and the county agents who disseminate the results of agricultural research. In education, these activities are the domain of educational research and development centers, regional educational laboratories, state departments of education, colleges and universities, national diffusion networks, intermediate service agencies, and staff development personnel within school districts. The rational view generally ignores the fact that school systems are already crowded with existing passive (though rational) recipients, who may not have the necessary time or expertise to adopt or apply (implement) the new knowledge or program.

House's technological perspective, the first of his three that address knowledge utilization and innovation processes, views change as a relatively mechanistic process and has an underlying image of products to be used and tasks to be done. Sashkin and Egermeier's fix-the-parts approach to change involves the adoption of proven innovations of various types to reach improvement. The empirical-rational, technological, and fix-the-parts depictions are parallel in their underlying philosophies and appear to assume that good innovations, without doubt, will be incorporated into practice. Sashkin and Egermeier note that adding political and cultural elements to the fix-the-parts approach enhances its success.

The power-coercive approach relies on influencing individuals and systems to change through legislation and external leverage where power of various types is the dominant factor.

Power-coercive/political/fix the people and the parts. The power-coercive approach relies on influencing individuals and systems to change through legislation and external leverage where power of various types is the dominant factor.

Power-coercive strategies emphasize political, economic, and moral sanctions, with the focus on using power of some type to "force" individuals to adopt the change. One strategy is nonviolent protest and demonstrations. A second strategy is the use of political institutions to achieve change — for example, changing educational policies through state-level legislation. Judicial decisions also impact educational policy. A third power-coercive strategy is recomposing or manipulating the power elite — electing people to public office, for instance, to support an intended change. History is replete with mandates, and other power-coercive strategies, that resulted in little change. Charters and Jones (1973) waggishly label the attention to such lack of results as an appraisal of non-events.

Charters and Jones (1973) waggishly label the attention to such lack of results as an appraisal of non-events.

House's political perspective is grounded in concepts of power, authority, and competing interests, with an image of negotiation. Sashkin and Egermeier's fix-the-people approach to change focuses on training and development of people, typically enacted as a top-down directive from the state or district level. Although Sashkin and Egermeier identify their fix-the-people approach primarily with Chin and Benne's empirical-rational and House's technological orientations, and secondarily on the normative-re-educative/cultural perspectives, it is easy to see how the political orientation has been applied historically to the fix-the-people (their attitudes, beliefs, values, behaviors) approach.

The overarching principle of this model is that the individual must take part in his/her own (re-education) change if it is to occur.

Normative-re-educative/cultural/fix the school. In the normative-re-educative approach, the individual is seen as actively in search of satisfying needs and interests. The individual does not passively accept what comes, but takes action to advance his/her goals. Further, changes are not just rational responses to new information but occur at the more personal level of values and habits. Additionally, the individual is guided by social and institutional norms. The overarching principle of this model is that the individual must take part in his/her own (re-education) change if it is to occur. The model includes direct intervention by change agents, who focus on the client system and who work collaboratively with the clients to identify and solve their problems.

Two strategies are germane to the normative-re-educative model. First is to focus on improving the problem-solving capabilities of the system; a second is to release and foster growth in the persons who make up the system. There is no assumption that better technical information can resolve the clients' problems; rather, the problems are thought more likely to be within the attitudes, values, or norms of various client-system relationships. The assumption of this model is that people are capable and creative and, if obstructions are removed, will rise to their highest potential. The model's strategies are based on this potential that resides within people and their system for change; thus it is not necessary that change be leveraged from outside the system.

House's cultural perspective has an underlying image of community, with shared meanings resting on shared values and people working together. Sashkin and Egermeier's fix-the-school approach develops the capacity of school organizations to solve their own problems. The three descriptions resonate and are compatible.

Sashkin and Egermeier (1992) analyze the three approaches and note that successful change has not yet been *wholly* achieved by any of the first three methods. However, they state that examining the *limited* success of those methods can contribute to the effectiveness of the fourth and most recent approach, which they label "fix-the-system," or restructuring. A reading of the paper reveals a factor that consistently correlates with the limited successes in each of the first three methods. That factor is the utilization of "interpersonal contact between the [project] agent and the users" (p. 3). To examine Sashkin and Egermeier's evidence in the fix-the-parts approach that employs Chin and Benne's empirical-rational approach and House's technological perspective, see Figure 3.

A reading of the paper reveals a factor that consistently correlates with the limited successes in each of the first three methods. That factor is the utilization of "interpersonal contact between the [project] agent and the users" (p. 3).

Figure 3: Early Studies of Change

Pilot State Dissemination Project
Seiber et al. (1972) noted that "effective adoptions were quite clearly related to interpersonal contact ... [including] needed information but [also] extensive technical assistance" (p. 3).

RAND Change Agent Study
McLaughlin (1989) cited strong leadership, high motivation and involvement of teachers, and long-term support as what worked in this study of four federally sponsored programs.

Project Innovation Packages
Horst et al. (1975) reported that teachers involved in the Project Innovation Packages received packages but no other information or assistance, resulting in generally negative outcomes.

National Diffusion Network
Emrick & Peterson (1978) reported favorable results when the new programs were accompanied by assistance and support, connecting users with specific innovations.

Research and Development Utilization Program
Louis, Rosenblum, & Molitor (1981) indicated that "provision of high quality information, technical assistance ... can be effective in promoting improvements in schools" (p. 5).

Experimental Schools Program
Doyle (1978) assessed that problems were underestimated and "knowledge ... about facilitators of change is usually ignored ... in this not laudably successful effort" (p. 5).

Individually Guided Education Program
Klausmeier (1990) stated that the program was "widely acclaimed and used, until Federal support for professional development and technical support activities was withdrawn" (p. 6).

Adapted from Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992

Sashkin and Egermeier conclude that, in a fix-the-parts approach, the "more personal assistance and continuing support from a skilled and knowledgeable local agent, the more likely that the innovation will be used [for a] ... long duration" (p. 7). They add that "personal support and expert assistance from a friendly outsider ... increases the effectiveness of knowledge dissemination" (p. 8).

Sashkin and Egermeier conclude that the "more personal assistance and continuing support from a skilled and knowledgeable local agent, the more likely that the innovation will be used [for a] ... long duration" (p. 7).

In the fix-the-people approach that links to House's political perspective, the focus is on improving the knowledge and skills of school staffs, thus enabling them to perform their roles. To accomplish this goal, preservice training, inservice training, and other staff development opportunities are mandated to support teacher and administrator performance, and the adoption of innovations (Fullan, 1990). "Staff development can be seen as another way to provide intensive personal support ... in the process of implementing an innovation" (Sashkin & Egermeier, p. 8).

Approach 3, fix-the-school by increasing the school's problem-solving capacity, emphasizes House's cultural perspective. This approach typically uses "one or more highly skilled consultants who help the organization learn" (Sashkin & Egermeier, p. 10). In most school improvement models that exemplify this approach, school teams "become their own consultants"; however, they receive "more than the usual degree of personal attention from the trainer/change agents" (p. 10). The long-term effects derived from use of such school improvement models have resulted in some schools' achieving

their school improvement goals and gaining positive impact on student outcomes.

Sashkin and Egermeier conclude that none of the three approaches has achieved long-term success. But, in the first three approaches (fix the parts, fix the people, fix the school), some success is reported and, where positive gains are noted, a change agent, assistor, or supporter is found. Sashkin and Egermeier's analysis allows the reader to identify the facilitator as a *correlate* of (at least partially) successful adoption, implementation, and/or change.

Sashkin and Egermeier's analysis allows the reader to identify the facilitator as a correlate of (at least partially) successful adoption, implementation, and/or change.

In recommending Approach 4, fix-the-system through comprehensive restructuring, Sashkin and Egermeier encourage incorporating all three of House's perspectives, with particular emphasis on cultural change. They note that the three approaches in isolation are not satisfactory, but they hypothesize, that in combination such an approach "holds real promise for successful change in schools" (p. 14). They articulate the components of "comprehensive" restructuring, none of which involves facilitation that will enable its implementation. It is not clear whether their attention to staff development for restructuring includes the personal interface dimension. No reference is made to the agent's or facilitator's role that attends to the individual's personal needs and that does appear in the discussions of success of the first three approaches.

Reflecting About These Approaches to Change

It is clear that several of the theoretical perspectives of Chin and Benne, House, and Sashkin and Egermeier are embraced by educators at all levels today. Decision makers at the state, district, and school levels readily accept the notion that "our people will adopt and implement the change because it is good" (empirical-rational approach). Highly placed policymakers mandate changes with the expectation that the force of their office will result in changes in practice (power-coercive approach). And yet reports of the conditions of schooling reflect that little change — in curriculum, instruction, or structural arrangements, for example — has occurred, despite the increasing need to serve all children more effectively.

The normative-re-educative approach employs the help of change agents to assist clients in the change process by identifying needs; suggesting solutions, examining alternatives, and planning actions; transforming intention into adoption; stabilizing the change. The use of an agent to support clients and facilitate change was present in the early models. The concept of change agent evolved further and has been reported in studies of educational and other organizational change.

The use of an agent to support clients and facilitate change was present in the early models.

Emerging Attention to Facilitation

In the seventies, Havelock (1971) introduced the idea of "linkers," or the human interface, to connect new

information and practice with those who could use them. In this concept, "linkage is seen as a series of two-way interaction processes which connect user systems with various resource systems" (p. 11-4), and was studied to identify its characteristics and effectiveness. Other studies sought to understand better the linking and facilitating role of the change agent.

The linkage role is concerned with establishing "communication networks between sources of innovations and users via an intermediary facilitating role either in the form of a linking agent or a linkage agency" (Paul, 1977, p. 26-27).

Linkage. The linkage role is concerned with establishing "communication networks between sources of innovations and users *via an intermediary facilitating role* either in the form of a linking agent or a linkage agency" (emphasis added) (Paul, 1977, p. 26-27). Paul conceptualized five components of the linkage role, Culbertson and Nash (1977) distinguished linking agents from nonlinking agents, Lieberman (1977) identified nine roles of linking agents, and Crandall (1977) delineated ten functions for the linker. These writers, in their various ways, agreed with Hood's characterizations of linking agent programs and projects that resulted from his review of major linking agent studies (1982). According to Hood, the programs and projects

- emphasized highly interpersonal forms of communication in order to connect school staff with knowledge sources
- focused attention of educators on new practices, particularly those resulting from research and development and practitioner-developed and -validated practices, then assisted educators in the

selection and implementation of new practices appropriate to their needs

- provided technical assistance for defining problems, identifying needs, selecting solutions, and planning for implementation and evaluation of the solutions selected
- provided educators with new competencies and improved problem-solving skills
- provided feedback from educators to information resource producers, trainers, R&D staff, and policy-makers.

It was assumed that users of new knowledge live in a system different from those who create that knowledge and that the systems are incompatible. Therefore, interaction must be achieved through sensitive linkage, with the linking agent spanning the boundaries of the two systems to bring about closer collaboration. Lipham (1977) suggested that the school administrator could serve as linking agent, spanning the boundaries and bringing resources from the larger environment to the local school. In order to be prepared to exercise this role, administrators would need competence in "educational change, program knowledge, decision involvement, instructional leadership, and facilitative environments" (p. 144) — an early hint about the principal's role as change facilitator.

Lipham (1977) suggested that the school administrator could serve as linking agent, spanning the boundaries and bringing resources from the larger environment to the local school.

Rand Change Agent Study. The Rand Change Agent Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) focused its research on three stages of the change process: initiation, or securing

support; implementation, in which the proposed change and the school are both changed in a process of "mutual adaptation"; and incorporation, the stage at which changes become a permanent part of the system.

Successful implementation of projects in the Rand Study was characterized by planning for adapting a change to the local setting. Teacher participation in adapting materials to the needs of the local school was a process characteristic. In addition, staff training was provided to meet the needs of local school personnel. Finally, a critical mass of innovators to provide support to one another and a receptive institutional setting for the innovation were required for success.

The active support of the principal was very important.

Implementation outcomes depended on internal factors: organizational climate, motivation of participants, the implementation strategy used by the local leaders, and the scope of the change. The active support of the principal was very important. When teachers perceived that the principal liked a project and actively supported it, the project fared well. "In general, the more supportive the principal was perceived to be, the higher was the percentage of project goals achieved, the greater the improvement in student performance, and the more extensive the continuation of project methods and materials." While the role of project directors in providing training for teachers to acquire new behaviors was important, the involvement of the principal in project training activities was a powerful element in the implementation strategy.

The elements of the implementation strategy that positively related to institutionalization were teacher training that was specific, concrete, and ongoing; and classroom consultation and advice from resource personnel. Observing more-experienced teacher peers in other classrooms provided opportunities for problem solving and reinforcing new users. Project meetings that attended to practical problems of project use, and sharing of suggestions had positive effects. Teacher participation in decision making positively related to effective implementation and continuation — in this activity, they "bought into" the project.

The Rand Study significantly expanded knowledge about factors necessary for implementing and institutionalizing change, a part of the process that had not been given much attention. These factors included

- teacher participation in decision making and adaptation of change to the local setting
- teacher and staff training
- a critical mass of teachers to support and motivate each other
- a receptive institutional setting/organizational climate
- the implementation strategy of local leaders, including consultation from resource personnel
- scope of the change
- shared experiences of teachers with peers and attendance to practical project problems
- the active support of the principal.

The Rand Study significantly expanded knowledge about factors necessary for implementing and institutionalizing change, a part of the process that had not been given much attention.

The study, reported by Crandall et al. (1982), confirmed teachers' need for facilitation during change.

Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI). This study examined the role of external agents and assistance in implementing federal- and state-supported programs. The study explored program implementation in terms of the fidelity perspective or mutual adaptation perspective — that is, was the program implemented as originally intended or had it evolved into new and different forms? The study, reported by Crandall et al. (1982), confirmed teachers' need for facilitation during change. Factors that contributed to successful implementation were

- carefully developed and well-defined curricular and instructional practices
- credible training
- teacher commitment
- ongoing assistance and support for teachers provided by district staff, external trainers and linkers, and other teachers
- assistance and firm direction from administrators.

Concluding This Section

A number of studies in the seventies, as indicated, began to take note of facilitation and implementation of change and clarified the need for a person(s) to assume the facilitating leader role. Studies in the eighties began to reveal more clearly the actions supplied by change facilitators in a variety of positions — for example, external consultants, principals, teacher teams, and superintendents. The next section explores and describes strategies of these facilitative leaders.

Leaders' Change-Facilitating Actions

Leadership is the process of translating intentions into reality.

— P. Block, 1987, p. 98

As suggested in the previous section, successful change of individuals' knowledge and practices in classrooms and schools appears to be accompanied by ongoing support and assistance to them as they are implementing the changes. This assistance comes in various forms and from various sources. One of the sources identified was school principals, who can exercise leadership in facilitating the change process. Principals are not the only persons providing facilitative leadership, however, for such leadership is not defined by positions on organizational charts. Rather, it is defined functionally.

Principals are not the only persons providing facilitative leadership, however, for such leadership is not defined by positions on organizational charts. Rather, it is defined functionally.

Leadership vs. Management

The attention to *leadership* has been unprecedented in business, and government, as well as education. What is the leadership function? One aspect of the leadership discussion for the past several years has focused on the distinction between *management*, which educational administrators typically do with reasonable success, and *leadership*, which

educational administrators allegedly do not do, but should. Although these concepts are frequently confused, several researchers have made a clear distinction.

For example, Gardner (1990) suggests that leadership is "the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (p. 1). Further, he reserves the term "managers" for individuals who "hold a directive post in an organization presiding over the resources by which the organization functions, allocating resources prudently, and making the best possible use of people" (Gardner, 1990, p. 3). In agreement, Tosi (1982) suggests that "leading is an influence process; managing may be seen as the act of making choices about the form and structure of those factors that fall within the boundaries of managerial discretion" (p. 233).

As early as 1978, Burns distinguished between the role of manager, who negotiates with employees to obtain balanced *transactions* of rewards for employee efforts, and the role of leader, who targets efforts to change, improve, and *transform* the organization. Tichy and Devanna (1986) expanded on Burns's ideas, asserting that managers engage in very little change but manage what is present and leave things much as they found them when they depart. Transformational leadership, they declared, focuses on change, innovation, and entrepreneurship. The leader changes and transforms the organization according to a vision of a preferred status. Leaders, then, are change makers and transformers, guiding

The leader changes and transforms the organization according to a vision of a preferred status.

the organization to a new and more compelling vision, a demanding role expectation. Transactional and transformational leadership are "often viewed as complementary," with transactional practices needed to get the day-to-day routines carried out (Leithwood, 1992b, p. 9). Leithwood, however, maintains that these "practices do not stimulate improvement ... transformational leadership provides the incentive" (p. 9).

Who are the leaders who stimulate improvement? "There is no single key actor" (Murphy, 1991c, p. 32). Leadership, as noted above, is defined by function. It is not restricted to people occupying particular positions. Any person who can deliver the leadership function is a leader. Such persons can include principals, superintendents, and school board members. However, teachers, parents, and community members can be significant educational leaders, as can central office consultants or specialists, external agency staff, and state department personnel. Students can act as leaders. Anyone can be a leader who provides leadership, "the process of translating intentions into reality" (Block, 1987, p. 98).

Any person who can deliver the leadership function is a leader.

The Need for Leaders

Deal (1990) maintains that "nothing will happen without leadership. From someone — or someplace — energy needs to be created, released, channeled, or mobilized to get the ball rolling in the right direction" (p. 4). "Research on schools in the last couple of decades leads to the interpretation that schools can develop as places for excellent teaching and

As Glatter (1987) points out, "there has too often been an assumption that you only need to introduce an innovation for it to be effectively absorbed by the institution" (p. 61).

learning, but left to their own devices many of them will not" (Wimpelberg, 1987, p. 100). As Glatter (1987) points out, "there has too often been an assumption that you only need to introduce an innovation for it to be effectively absorbed by the institution" (p. 61). As Block maintains, leaders are needed to translate intentions into reality.

Many researchers have reported the importance of effective school-based leadership (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; Fullan, 1985; Rutherford, 1985), and effective district-level leadership in bringing about change and improvement (Coleman & LaRocque, 1990; Hill, Wise, & Shapiro, 1989; Jacobson, 1986; Muller, 1989; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985; Paulu, 1988). The challenge for these leaders is to provide teaching/learning conditions and school and district structures (curricular, organizational, physical) that enable students to function effectively and develop the attributes necessary for lifelong learning, independent living, and participation as a contributing member of society. School improvement efforts to realize these outcomes will be enhanced by the vision and leadership of many individuals, internal and external to the system (Cohen, 1987; Goodlad, 1975; Fullan, 1991; Hall & Hord, 1987; Schlechty, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1990b). These individuals will include school board members, superintendent and other central office staff, principals, lead/mentor teachers, parents and community representatives, and others at the regional and state levels (Barth, 1988; Engel, 1990; Johnston, Bickel, & Wallace, 1990).

The Leaders

Cawelti (1987) noted that "research has documented what common sense has long dictated: that school leaders *do* determine whether or not schools are successful" (p. 3). This growing knowledge base points to the importance of effective principals to student success in school. Beginning with the effective schools studies, which were conducted largely in low socioeconomic settings, for example by Edmonds (1979), Lezotte and Bancroft (1985), Venezky and Winfield (1979), and others, the more effective campuses were found to be administered by strong educational leaders.

Principals. Thomas, as early as 1978, studying the role of principal in managing diverse programs, concluded that many factors affect implementation, but none so much as the leadership of the campus principal. More recently, the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (1983) identified the primary determining factor of excellence in public schools as the skillful leadership of the individual principal. The Task Force report further noted that on campuses where principals have leadership skills and are highly motivated, the effects have been startling, *regardless of the unique ethnic or socioeconomic factors of the school community and the nature of the populations the school serves.*

Thomas concluded that many factors affect implementation, but none so much as the leadership of the campus principal.

Research and "exemplary practice" have documented that the principal is a central element in improving instructional programs within the school (Fullan, 1991; Hansen & Smith, 1989). Andrews maintained in an interview with Brandt

(1987) that "gains and losses in students' test scores are directly related to teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership" (Brandt, 1987, p. 9). Lieberman and Miller (1981) noted that the principal is critical in making changes happen in schools. Reinhard, Arends, Kutz, Lovell, and Wyant (1980) determined that, at each stage of the change process, contributions by the principal were extremely important to the project's overall success.

Targeting the principal as a leader of change, studies have focused on what effective principals do.

Targeting the principal as a leader of change, studies have focused on what effective principals do. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) found that "effective" principals were proactive in nature and took steps to secure support for change efforts on behalf of their students. Stallings and Mohlman (1981) indicated that principals who were particularly effective in program implementation went out of their way to be helpful to teachers and staff, were constructive in criticism they provided, and explained their reasons for suggesting behavior changes. They shared new ideas, set good examples by being on time or staying late when necessary, were well prepared, and cared for the personal welfare of their teachers (Rutherford, Hord, Huling, & Hall, 1983).

Little (1981) found that effective change facilitation occurred in schools that were administered by principals who "communicate particular expectations to teachers; model the norms they support; sanction teachers who perform well by using and allocating available resources; and protect teachers from outside interferences by acting as a 'buffer' between the

district and the needs of the teachers" (p. 97). From a four-year study of London schools, Mortimore and Sammons (1987) reported 12 key factors related to schools' effectiveness. The first of these was the principal's purposeful leadership of the staff, where the principal "understands the needs of the school and is actively involved in the school's work, without exerting total control over the staff" (p. 7).

The first of these was the principal's purposeful leadership of the staff, where the principal "understands the needs of the school and is actively involved in the school's work, without exerting total control over the staff" (p. 7).

In a description of principals' behaviors relating to successful change facilitation, Rutherford and colleagues (1983) found the following factors:

> They have a clear vision of short and long-range goals for the school, and they work intensely with brute persistence to attain their vision. The achievement and happiness of students is their first priority; and they have high expectations for students, teachers, and themselves. They are actively involved in decision-making relative to instructional and administrative affairs, and they attend to instructional objectives as well as instructional strategies. They collect information that keeps them well informed about the performance of their teachers; they involve teachers in decision-making but within the framework of established goals and expectations; and directly or indirectly they provide for the development of teachers' knowledge and skills, and they protect the school and faculty from unnecessary intrusions. They seek policy changes at the district level for the benefit of the school, and they give enthusiastic support to a change. They provide for the personal welfare of teachers, and also model the norms they want teachers to support. They aggressively seek support for resources within and outside the school to foster the goals of the school. (Adapted from p. 113)

Leadership teams. While the early studies of leader behaviors for change focused largely on principals, it also

Principals were aided by assistant principals (Mortimore & Sammons, 1987), by formally organized school improvement teams of teachers, central office personnel, and external consultants. Parents, too, were active.

became clear from these studies that principals were aided by assistant principals (Mortimore & Sammons, 1987), by formally organized school improvement teams of teachers, and by more informal but collegial arrangements with "change facilitator" teachers on their staff, central office personnel, and external consultants (Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984). Parents, too, were active. Cawelti (1987) noted that "we face a critical shortage of instructional leaders" (p. 3), thus there is a need to encourage leadership wherever it may be found.

Superintendents use, at the district level, strategies that are parallel to those used by principals at the school level.

Superintendents. An emerging knowledge base has been developing about strategies used by the district-level executive, whose area of responsibility is the entire district and community. Research studies have shown that superintendents develop particular relationships with principals as their allies for change. Superintendents use, at the district level, strategies that are parallel to those used by principals at the school level. It is not conceivable that all superintendents who are facilitating change effectively can allocate major amounts of their time to these efforts. Therefore, many superintendents delegate responsibilities to central office staff but nevertheless actively monitor the process and progress of reform.

A schema by which to consider what principals, leadership teams, superintendents, and other leaders do to implement change has been adapted from a formulation reported by Hord and Huling-Austin (1986). The findings that follow apply to principals and superintendents (whose actions

typically have high impact) and to all other persons in any positions who are willing and able to exercise the actions described.

A Six-Component Framework

From a longitudinal study that focused specifically on identifying the actions or interventions of principals and other facilitators in behalf of teachers' implementation of change, a classification of interventions resulted (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986). Eight functional classifications of interventions were used to organize the actions of principals and other facilitators (see Figure 4).

Eight functional classifications of interventions were used to organize the actions of principals and other facilitators.

Figure 4. Classifications of Interventions

Developing Supportive Organizational Arrangements	planning, managing, providing materials, resources, space, etc.
Training	teaching, reviewing, and clarifying new knowledge and skills
Monitoring and Evaluation	collecting, analyzing, reporting, and transferring data
Providing Consultation and Reinforcement	promoting innovation use through problem solving and technical assistance to individual users
External Communication	informing outsiders
Dissemination	gaining support of outsiders and promoting use of the innovation by outsiders
Impeding	discouraging or interrupting use
Expressing and Responding to Concerns	complimenting, praising, acknowledging, complaining, reprimanding

Adapted from Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986, p. 105

Of these eight functions, four are represented most frequently in the studies of school change: (1) providing logistical and organizational arrangements, (2) training, (3) monitoring and evaluation, and (4) providing consultation/ problem solving and reinforcement. In addition, two other functions are prominent in the literature on change implementation: creating an atmosphere and culture for change, and communicating the vision. A six-part framework, then, is used here to report findings about leaders' roles in implementing change. Note that the Hord and Huling-Austin (1986) labels have been slightly modified for improved reader understanding (i.e., "consultation and reinforcement" has been renamed, "continuing to give assistance"):

Of these eight functions four are represented most frequently in the studies of school change: (1) providing logistical and organizational arrangements, (2) training, (3) monitoring and evaluation, and (4) providing consultation / problem solving and reinforcement. In addition, two other functions are prominent in the literature on change implementation: creating an atmosphere and culture for change, and communicating the vision.

- Creating an atmosphere and culture for change
- Developing and communicating the vision
- Planning and providing resources
- Providing training and development
- Monitoring and checking progress
- Continuing to give assistance.

Creating an atmosphere and culture for change. "No ... effort studied caught fire without an active superintendent willing to ... attack the school system's inertia" (Hill, Wise, & Shapiro, 1989, p. 20). Superintendents work actively to challenge administrators, teachers, and other staff to create innovative ideas and make suggestions for improvement. To develop this attitude toward change, they arrange meetings for staff to share their ideas, and they support staff's risk-taking

activities by acknowledging that mistakes will be made. They declare consistently that mistakes will be followed by learning. Superintendents express the value of principals who take actions for change, not for the status quo (Paulu, 1988). One way principals symbolize action and involvement is to be a highly visible presence in the school and in classrooms; teachers "seek these principals out; they want them in their classrooms" (Brandt, 1987, p. 13).

So that an internal change climate could flourish, superintendents spend time and energy managing issues external to the schools.

So that an internal change climate could flourish, superintendents spend time and energy managing issues external to the schools. They do this through sensitivity to community concerns and activity in public relations, keeping the community informed. They make sure that a harmonious environment pervades the district in order to nurture the internal creativity of the school staffs. Murphy, Hallinger, and Peterson (1985) reported that superintendents engage in district internal culture building through several activities:

- being available to speak to and communicate with staff; having an open-door policy, never being too busy to interact with staff and exhibit interest and support
- being a team player and building coalitions, team work groups, and committees to address issues
- being concerned about staff and visiting schools to support staff morale
- being a problem solver by securing rapid solutions to problems and cutting through red tape.

At the school level principals can act to shape the culture.

At the school level principals can act to shape the culture. From an analysis of five case studies, Deal and Peterson (1990) cite the following behaviors used by principals to develop a particular culture in the school:

- developing a sense of mission and values about what the school should be, discussing this with faculty and community and gradually defining it
- selecting staff who can share, express, and reinforce the values of the leader in order to help build the desired culture
- facing conflict, being willing to deal with disputes, and through conflict, building unity
- using daily routines and concrete actions and behaviors to demonstrate and exemplify values and beliefs
- telling stories to illustrate what they value in school, spreading the stories that become legends
- nurturing the traditions and rituals to express, define, and reinforce the school culture.

The five principals in the five case studies used these six tactics in a variety of ways, based on their particular schools and their preferences for a specific kind of culture (Deal & Peterson, 1990). For an extensive review of cultural and contextual factors, see Boyd (1992).

Developing and communicating the vision. In this paper vision is distinguished from mission, which is thought of as the purpose for which the district and/or school exists and

Vision refers to mental pictures of what the school or its parts (programs, processes, etc.) might look like in a changed and improved state — a preferred image of the future.

indicates what the district/school's intended outcomes will be. Vision refers to mental pictures of what the school or its parts (programs, processes, etc.) might look like in a changed and improved state — a preferred image of the future. Brandt (1987), reporting on Andrews's work in 100 schools, cites the principal's role in setting vision for the school as a high priority in achieving effectiveness. Yet, Fullan (1992) observes, a good principal does not singly create a vision and impose it; he or she builds a vision together with the participants of the school organization. In this way, "it becomes the common ground, the shared vision that compels all involved" (Méndez-Morse, 1992, in press). Buck's research (1989) cites the superintendent's vision as driving the organization to achieve its next stage of evolution.

Although Cuban (1985) specified that one role of the superintendent is as teacher of the district staff and community, introducing new ideas and possibilities for improving the district's schools, superintendents must be careful initially to align their suggestions with the community's beliefs and values (Hord, 1992). In Hord's study of superintendents' exiting of the role, respondents suggested that the superintendent might take such measures as hiring a sociologist to provide information about the community's shifts in values and cultural norms, so the superintendent could be aware of the situation and act accordingly.

Respondents also suggested that successful superintendents (those who provide effective programs for students and remain in their job) start with where the community and the staff are, work with these constituents

collegially to study, review, and reflect on new ideas acquired through printed material and consultants, and develop new visions and plans for improving the school system. The superintendent provides an initial vision, and that vision expands through the interactions just described. Staff and community members are solicited to work on committees and task forces to shape and fill the original skeletal vision. Regularly and frequently the superintendent describes and promotes the vision to the public through radio and TV interview shows, through weekly interactions at the Rotary and Lions clubs, and at the community's favorite coffee shop. The superintendent increases the information flow to the district's professionals during periods of vision development through memos, items in the district's newsletter, and even at the football awards banquet. In addition, he or she spends a great deal of time in schools, explicitly articulating the district vision and priorities with administrators, teachers, and all other staff.

In addition, he or she spends a great deal of time in schools, explicitly articulating the district vision and priorities with administrators, teachers, and all other staff.

From their case studies of six urban high schools, Louis and Miles (1990) report that effective school leaders, those who realize change in their schools, are able to talk about their vision(s) for the school so that others understand and believe that the vision reflects their own interests. Such a vision doesn't have to be tightly defined, these authors suggest, but it should be realistic. Leaders first encourage participation in vision development (Hill, Wise, & Shapiro, 1989) and, second, help people develop images of "how to get there," so that action is directly tied to the vision and ownership is developed. "Both dimensions of the vision are both sharable and shared" (Boyd,

1992, p. 50). Boyd advises, "A clear vision of the school when the change is successfully implemented and how implementation will occur needs to be developed among all in the school" (1992, p. 51).

One way leaders entice staff to participate in vision development is through the study of student-performance data. In developing visions for improvement that relate to at-risk students, leaders may encounter resistance if the staff believe that "those kids can't learn any better anyway" (see Boyd, 1992, for discussion of beliefs and cultural norms). Vision building with a staff seems not necessarily to be influenced by the leader's race or ethnicity in at-risk settings. For instance, a Hispanic principal was a very successful leader for change with a predominantly white staff (Hord & Huling-Austin, 1986), and white superintendents led the charge to successful change in behalf of black and Hispanic students with a mix of white and minority staff (Hill, Wise, & Shapiro, 1989) (see Méndez-Morse, 1992, for discussion of leader characteristics).

Louis and Miles (1990) learned that even when the initial vision ideas spring from the principal (or even the district office), teachers, department heads, and school-based specialists need to know they can influence the vision (and its actualization) in significant ways.

Real ownership means sharing influence and authority. Louis and Miles (1990) learned that even when the initial vision ideas spring from the principal (or even the district office), teachers, department heads, and school-based specialists need to know they can influence the vision (and its actualization) in significant ways. The staff should be rewarded for contributing ideas relative to the vision. Sharing the vision is not just a matter of exhorting staff to believe but also a way of sharing responsibility and accountability. Change leaders share success

stories among the entire staff to reinforce the belief that change and achievement of the vision are possible. Not only do they communicate the vision and invite interest, but they do so frequently and consistently (Paulu, 1988).

Communicating the purpose of the school and its vision for improvement, and demonstrating visible commitment to the vision were cited as leadership functions that must be fulfilled in all improving schools (DeBevoise, 1984; Gersten & Carnine, 1981). Effective leaders can easily articulate their vision and goals for their schools (Manasse, 1982; MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983; Rutherford, 1985). When asked, they respond with enthusiasm, reflecting a personal belief in and active support for their goals (Manasse, 1984). Furthermore, staff working with these leaders express the same vision for the school as the leaders do, though not necessarily in the same language. They also understand their leaders' expectations.

Communicating the purpose of the school and its vision for improvement, and demonstrating visible commitment to the vision were cited as leadership functions that must be fulfilled in all improving schools (DeBevoise, 1984; Gersten & Carnine, 1981).

Vision and goal setting establish the parameters for leaders' subsequent actions, giving them a clear image of their schools in order to set priorities (Manasse, 1985). They use the goals as a continuing source of motivation and planning (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Manasse, 1984; MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983) and as a basis for providing clear, consistent, and well-communicated policy (McCurdy, 1983).

Planning and providing resources. In describing change strategies at the local district and individual school

levels, Fullan (1985) provides guidelines about factors that should be addressed at either level. An initial step at both levels is the development of a plan that may evolve through interaction with participants, or that may be developed by the leader(s). Louis and Miles (1990) prefer the evolutionary approach. They suggest that leadership in change processes involves planning. Further, effective planning for serious change in schools should avoid a grandiose "blueprinting" approach and instead have a strong evolutionary character.

Both the change program and the school develop steadily, driven by the goals for change and the shared vision. New opportunities are sought or appear serendipitously; data on the progress of the improvement effort suggest detours or new avenues; new capacities develop and permit more ambitious efforts than anyone had dreamed of. Evolutionary planning is not a hand-to-mouth approach but coherent, intelligent adaptation based on direct experience with what is working in moving toward the vision and what isn't.

However, when a leader visits schools and classrooms and understands what administrators and teachers are doing, the probability that those resources are relevant increases (Brandt, 1987; Peterson, 1984).

Leaders think broadly about resources, and providing resources has always been accepted as a part of the leader's role in change. However, when a leader visits schools and classrooms and understands what administrators and teachers are doing, the probability that those resources are relevant increases (Brandt, 1987; Peterson, 1984). Superintendents use resource allocations to emphasize what the district's priorities are; for example, they provide enriched budgets for materials and resources focused on

instructional improvement (Peterson, Murphy, & Hallinger, 1987), rather than on new carpeting for the district office.

In the more-successful districts the resources are not only additional dollars but also reallocations of time, people, materials, existing equipment, and assistance. Boyd (1992) points out, from her review of the literature, that change frequently fails because insufficient time was allocated. "The lack of resources has been a major barrier to sustained change efforts" (Boyd, 1992, p. 25). Successful leaders are more effective in putting dollars where they can make a real difference (Louis & Miles, 1990). Thus, leaders make resources available and allocate those resources in ways that maximize teacher change and effectiveness and, thus, student achievement (Rutherford, 1985). Fullan (1985) also suggests that emphasis be placed on such resources as released time for planning and training. It is not only material resources that count but also the time and energy demanded of people to plan, share, observe, and take action (Fullan, 1985).

Thus, leaders make resources available and allocate those resources in ways that maximize teacher change and effectiveness and, thus, student achievement (Rutherford, 1985).

Fullan emphasizes that "[E]ach school must be assisted by someone trained in supporting the endeavor ... [Such] assistance is directed toward facilitating and prodding the process" (p. 414). Additional resources, according to Fullan, should be focused on developing the principal's leadership role and on developing the leadership team's role also (Fullan, 1991).

Often change is not initiated or is not successful because people believe they do not have enough money. Effective school change requires being proactive — grabbing, getting, testing the limits in acquiring needed resources (Huff, Lake, & Schaalman, 1982), and taking advantage of potential resources rather than waiting for them to be provided. The image comes to mind of the school leader as a garage sale junkie, able to browse and find what the school needs in the most unlikely places, thus ensuring support for special projects (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982).

Leaders also stay abreast of new research and practice developments in curriculum and learning. They read and report on recent research at faculty meetings; they use lunch hours with staff to talk about research findings and proposed program ideas (Little, 1982). They search the environment for new information to share with teachers (McCurdy, 1983) and encourage their teachers to do the same (Louis & Miles, 1990).

A leadership function that must be satisfied in all improving schools is that of providing staff development (DeBevoise, 1984).

Providing training and development. A leadership function that must be satisfied in all improving schools is that of providing staff development (DeBevoise, 1984). In her review, Boyd (1992) reports that skill building and training are part of the process of change. Learning to do something new involves initial doubts about one's ability, incremental skill development, some successful experiences, and eventually clarity, meaning, and ownership (Fullan, 1985). Effective leaders use formal and informal data to identify needs of the staff for training and development (Little, 1982). Fullan's review of change strategies (1985), Joyce and Showers's

research on staff development (1980), and Sergiovanni's writings of his experiences in working with leaders in schools (1990b) suggest investing early in demonstrations and modeling; later, when people are actually trying out new practice, training workshops prove more effective. School leaders who will assist the implementers with new practice, whether they are principals, special teachers, central office personnel, or others, will need training for their role.

Louis and Miles (1990) assert that training and support are master resources to help staff. One tactic used by effective principals is to arrange for staff members to serve as staff developers for others in their school, according to Andrews and reported by Brandt (1987). Many change efforts founder because teachers (and administrators) simply have not been provided with the opportunities to acquire the new skills that they need; frustration rather than resistance becomes the factor that undermines the planned activities. To demonstrate their commitment, effective leaders participate directly in staff development, taking an active role in planning, conducting, implementing, and evaluating in-service training (Odden, 1983; Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985). By participating in staff development with principals and teachers, superintendents demonstrate that they, too, are a part of the community of learners in search of improvement (Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985).

Many change efforts founder because teachers (and administrators) simply have not been provided with the opportunities to acquire the new skills that they need; frustration rather than resistance becomes the factor that undermines the planned activities.

Monitoring and checking progress. School improvement efforts, no matter how well planned, will always encounter problems at all stages. Some are so insignificant

that they may not even be perceived as problems. Others are more severe. Louis and Miles (1990) cite the need for continuous monitoring in order to coordinate or orchestrate the change effort within the school and deal with problems appropriately. Any change effort that is more than trivial, or that involves many parts of the school, becomes a set of management issues. For example, key personnel leave the school and a component of the change effort is left leaderless; a new state mandate is passed that distracts staff from their own programs; a serious student discipline problem undermines a campaign to increase positive community involvement; after a review, staff believe that a major component of the program does not "fit" the school.

They gather information through formal observations but use informal methods as well, including walking the hallways, popping in and out of classrooms, attending grade-level and departmental meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with individual teachers.

Louis and Miles observe that effective change facilitators constantly search for, confront, and acknowledge serious problems when they first appear and act rapidly to make major adjustments to solve them. Effective leaders become frequent visitors in the classrooms of at-risk students. They take time to discover what is happening in classrooms. They gather information through formal observations but use informal methods as well, including walking the hallways, popping in and out of classrooms, attending grade-level and departmental meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with individual teachers. They follow up visits with feedback to teachers and plans for improving their use of new practices (Rutherford, 1985).

In a 1984 review of research on principals as instructional leaders, DeBevoise identified monitoring student and teacher

performance as a significant strategy of leaders in an array of socioeconomic school contexts, including sites with high percentages of low-income students. Superintendents, as well, play an active role in monitoring change and improvement efforts (Pollack, Chrispeels, Watson, Brice, & McCormack, 1988). Pollack and colleagues report that superintendents use school and classroom visits to inspect curriculum and instruction and to assess progress in the implementation of new curriculum. They collect school and classroom products associated with the change. Student test data are used to monitor the impact of the change on students, as well as to provide input for the superintendents' supervision and evaluation of principals. Superintendents required change strategies to be implemented and followed up with principals to be sure that they were (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986).

Pollack and colleagues report that superintendents use school and classroom visits to inspect curriculum and instruction and to assess progress in the implementation of new curriculum.

Fullan (1985) expands on the idea of monitoring by specifying three considerations for collecting information on progress toward implementation. The first consideration is *what kind of information to collect*. By this, Fullan means finding out:

- What is the state of implementation in the classroom?
- What factors are affecting implementation? (What are the obstacles to and the facilitators of change in classroom practice, e.g., role of the principal, assistants, etc.?)

- What are the outcomes? (What skills and attitudes of teachers are changing? How are student learning outcomes changing?) (p. 410).

The second consideration is *the degree of formality of data collection,* or how to gather the information. Formal methods include surveys, observation, testing, and such; informal methods involve interaction among implementers, between implementers and administraters, and between implementers and other facilitators. Fullan points to data-collection techniques developed by Hall and colleagues on concerns of teachers and levels of implementation of new practices (reported in Hall & Hord, 1987) as examples of techniques that can be used in both formal and informal ways. The resulting information is used in Fullan's third consideration, *consulting with and assisting the implementers.*

The key to this strategy is the word "continuing."

Continuing to give assistance. The key to this strategy is the word "continuing." Resource provision and training are not one-shot events, for instance. As implementers move from novice to expert in their improvement efforts, their needs will change. Information about these needs is gathered through monitoring; assistance is then structured to focus appropriately on the needs. For example, if data indicate that some teachers have concerns about how to manage new practices in their classrooms, then the leader can share information, demonstrating or modeling new approaches, or arranging for teachers to visit classrooms in which the management issues have been resolved. If monitoring

reveals that particular implementers are not putting specific components of the envisioned change into place, leaders can then help the implementers to incorporate the missing pieces into their practice. The leaders can assist by organizing lesson designs, arranging materials, and walking through lesson plans with implementers (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

Attention to Fullan's third monitoring consideration can provide the basis for planning further assistance to the implementers. Thus, this function involves providing technical assistance to the implementers in a variety of formats — one-to-one help from peers, administrators, or district resource staff; sharing among implementers; visits to sites where implementation has occurred. Relatively simple support, such as arranging for teachers' released time to meet *regularly*, cited earlier in "planning and providing resources," can produce important results if the changing implementation needs of teachers are addressed with useful information and tips on how to make the changes work in their classrooms, for example.

Thus, this function involves providing technical assistance to the implementers in a variety of formats

Small, regular amounts of time to foster formal and informal interaction among implementers is a necessity. Change lives or dies, according to Huberman and Crandall (1983), depending on the amount of time and assistance that is provided — and, one might add, the quality and appropriateness of the assistance. In staff development literature, Joyce and Showers (1980) refer to such assistance as coaching. In Bush's study of the effects of staff

development components (1984), coaching accounted for up to 84% of the variance of successful transfer of new practices into classrooms.

Direct, on-site assistance by the superintendent or other central office colleagues is a component of the superintendents' plan for assisting principals in implementing change (Coleman & LaRocque, 1990). Giving consistent attention and acting on problems that are identified involves enormous persistence and tenacity, and good leaders attack problems from every possible angle over a period of months (or even years) (Louis & Miles, 1990). The ability to be an effective leader for change requires a high tolerance for complexity and ambiguity. Coping with problems is difficult because not all the needs can be foreseen. Yet leaders tend to exhibit a willingness to live with risks, as they try various ways to solve persistent issues (Hall & Hord, 1987). They also look for positive features, and they directly and sincerely recognize and praise the teachers responsible (Rutherford, 1985). Celebrating progress is an important part of this sixth strategy, an aspect of it that is most often overlooked. Through a dual focus on positive progress and on identification of problems, followed by the necessary corrective action, leaders support the goals and expectations that they have established for their schools (Hall & Hord, 1987).

Celebrating progress is an important part of this sixth strategy, an aspect of it that is most often overlooked.

Tools and Techniques for Leaders

During the seventies and eighties the need for facilitating change became more clear. A parallel need was to

understand the change process better and to clarify the role of the facilitators. A series of studies was launched to meet this need, and the Concerns-Based Adoption Model was developed.

Tools for change facilitators. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model resulted from longitudinal studies of change in schools and colleges. The task was to understand what was needed to provide support for the implementation stage of the change process. The outcomes were concepts, tools, and techniques for the use of the change facilitator. Three diagnostic components included Stages of Concern, which describes the affective side of change, or how individuals respond or feel about a change; Levels of Use, how individuals are behaving relative to a change; and Innovation Configuration, how the change is being put into effect in classrooms and schools. Two prescriptive frameworks for change facilitators were developed out of these studies: the Intervention Taxonomy, which classifies the kinds of interventions needed for successful change, and the Intervention Anatomy, which characterizes various aspects of an intervention.

The task was to understand what was needed to provide support for the implementation stage of the change process.

Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973) conceptualized the seminal model and Hall and Hord (1987) and Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1987) produced a compilation of the studies. Seven basic assumptions informed the research, were verified, and provided guidelines for structuring the change facilitator's activities.

The first principle is understanding that change is a process, not an event; therefore, change requires time, energy, and the resources to support it as it unfolds.

Principles of change facilitation. The first principle is understanding that change is a process, not an event; therefore, change requires time, energy, and the resources to support it as it unfolds. Second, change is accomplished by individuals first, then by institutions. There is, of course, individual/organizational interaction in the process of change. It is difficult, for instance, for individuals in a school to become collegial if the organization does not change scheduling and other structures to allow or support this to happen. The model, however, assumes primacy of the individual, suggesting that only when the persons in an organization have changed, can it be said that the organization has changed. Third, change is a highly personal experience (thus the focus on the individual as the unit of analysis in this model); individuals change at different rates and in different ways.

Fourth, change entails growth in both feelings about and skills in using new programs; thus, individuals change in these two important ways over the course of a change experience. Fifth, interventions can be designed to support the individual's implementation of the innovation. The change facilitator should take into account the feelings and skills of the individual when planning actions to support the change process. Sixth, the change facilitator needs to adapt to the differing needs of individuals and to their changing needs over time. Last, the change facilitator must consider the systemic nature of the organization when making interventions, since activities targeted for one area of the system may well have unanticipated effects in another.

The change facilitator has tools for collecting diagnostic information about individuals and the innovation during the process of change. Based on the diagnostic data, the change facilitator makes interventions selected from the resources available and targeted appropriately for the individuals. The model is based on the hypothesis that proactive facilitators, working in particular ways, will enable new programs, or innovations, to be implemented more effectively and efficiently, moving over time toward desired goals.

The premise that "change is a process," first stated in 1973 by Hall, Wallace, and Dossett, has been verified in other studies of change and is now a widely espoused axiom. Beer, Eisenstat, and Spector (1990) in the corporate sector, for example, report that "companies need a particular mind-set for managing change: one that emphasizes process ... persistence over a long period of time as opposed to quick fixes" (p. 166). However, current practice at all educational levels — school, district, state, and national — tends to ignore this concept. Many educational policymakers behave as if change is a single event and can simply be mandated. Such a view ignores the critical period of implementation, putting change into place, and the requirements for support by knowledgeable and skilled facilitators.

Many educational policymakers behave as if change is a single event and can simply be mandated. Such a view ignores the critical period of implementation, putting change into place, and the requirements for support by knowledgeable and skilled facilitators.

A Few More Words about Facilitation

Fullan (1991) and Huberman and Miles (1984) maintain that leaders at all levels must provide "specific implementation pressure and support" (Fullan, 1991, p. 198).

From studying exemplary schools, Sagor (1992) notes a constant push for improvement; "the secret seemed to be in providing the right combination of pressure to improve along with meaningful support" (p. 13). One way leaders maintain pressure is by continually asking probing questions, "yet providing teachers with personal support" (p. 18). They specify that the bottom line for making change at the school or district level can be characterized by the two terms "pressure" and "support." This "bare-bones" formulation has been expressed succinctly by researchers, policy analysts, and practitioners in the field:

They specify that the bottom line for making change at the school or district level can be characterized by the two terms "pressure" and "support."

> [Change] ... encompasses a world of complexity, and realizing and maintaining the delicate yet crucial balance between the humanitarian concerns of supportive behavior and the pragmatic dictates of responsible authority could be fairly said to constitute the fundamental practical problem of change management. (Hord, 1987, p. 81)
>
> Effective implementation requires a strategic balance of pressure and support. (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 171)
>
> [A]dministrative decisiveness bordering on coercion, but intelligently and supportively exercised, may be the surest path to significant school improvement. (Huberman & Miles, 1986, p. 70)

Leaders who supply these dimensions know how to both "empower people and yell, charge. They are both generals and sheepherders" (Andrews, quoted by Brandt, 1987, p. 13). They gather a team together that guides the rest of the staff; team members are the sheep dogs who keep the whole group moving together. But the leader has to be the shepherd, the

"keeper of the dream ... [and] the direction" (Brandt, 1987, p. 13).

When viewed through the dual lenses of pressure and support, the six categories of leaders' actions take on additional significance for change efforts. As suggested above, one (pressure or support) without the other will not result in implementation of new policies, practices, programs. It is the careful blending of the two, shaped to the needs of each individual implementer and delivered through the behaviors of leaders, that takes care of and promotes change.

It is the careful blending of the two, shaped to the needs of each individual implementer and delivered through the behaviors of leaders, that takes care of and promotes change.

Concluding This Section

The sixties and seventies saw the development of approaches to guide the operation and attainment of organizations' goals. That period also focused on models to guide organizational change and on strategies to disseminate new knowledge to potential users. The need for persons to supply the human interface for the implementation of new knowledge and practices became increasingly clear.

It is no great surprise that the successful school change stories of the eighties consistently featured the principal as the leader who supplied the human interface — the support and the pressure — for change. During that decade, however, researchers learned of other facilitative leaders (Hord, Stiegelbauer, & Hall, 1984), and the idea of a facilitative team was identified and studied (Hall & Hord, 1986). Pajak and

Glickman (1989) reported studies of three school districts in which leadership came "from a variety of positions and levels" (p. 61). In one district, "prime agents" (Pajak & Glickman's terminology) were lead teachers, assistant principals, and central office staff. In another district, prime agents were central office staff, with principals playing a supporting role. In a third district (all of these efforts were targeting district-wide change), prime agents were representative teachers at various grade levels and schools, "who served on schoolwide committees coordinated by central office supervisory staff" (Pajak & Glickman, 1989, p. 63). The idea of a facilitative team (at the school level) was reinforced by the effective schools/school improvement process designs of that era, which included a leadership or school improvement team in the change strategy. This team directed, supported, guided, and represented the larger staff in the planning and implementation of school change.

The idea of a facilitative team (at the school level) was reinforced by the effective schools/school improvement process designs of that era, which included a leadership or school improvement team in the change strategy.

This paper has described the evolving recognition of the need for leadership to facilitate change. It has given attention to the principal and the superintendent as key facilitative leaders and to the expansion of the facilitative leadership function to a team or council that includes teachers, other staff, and community members. This historical review of the past several decades provides the background for considering the role of facilitative leadership in restructuring or systemic change, which is the focus of the next section.

Leadership for Restructuring or Systemic Change

Children are the living messages
we send to a time we will not see.

— N. Postman, 1982, p. xi

The increasing problems of poverty and social disruption in the lives of our children are more threatening than ever before. To rescue children "from hopelessness and violence," we must consider dramatic changes in educational programs and social services (Hayes, 1992, p. 724). Reactions to this appeal and to the call for major educational changes have been mixed. At the federal executive and legislative level, much interest and concern have been expressed, but few substantive measures have materialized. Many professional educators, on the one hand, call for massive systemic change or restructuring of schools. Others point to the lack of clear empirical evidence that promises results from restructuring (Fullan, 1991) or to the lack of real need for doing so (Gabbett, 1991). The Sandia National Laboratories report *Perspective on Education in America* (Carson, Huelskamp, & Woodall, 1991) "concludes the nation's education system doesn't need a complete overhaul" (Gabbett, 1991, p. A1). In light of these conflicting messages, how might leaders consider whether

Many professional educators call for massive systemic change or restructuring of schools.

restructuring is a possibility for their schools, districts, communities, and regional and state educational agencies?

Negative Notes

Corbett (1990) defines restructuring as major changes in roles, relationships, and rules to obtain new results in schools and districts.

Corbett (1990) defines restructuring as major changes in roles, relationships, and rules to obtain new results in schools and districts. The need for restructuring and integrating the resources of the broader environment with those of schools has been proposed (Hayes, 1992). Fullan (1991) acknowledges the potential of restructuring schools and altering the relationships of schools to the external forces that surround them. As Fullan admits, there is a "strong conceptual rationale" for restructuring schools but not much positive outcome data to support it (p. 88); "there is more of a sense of promise" (Murphy, 1992, p. 91). Hallinger and Edwards (1992) note that research describing the "successful implementation of large scale, system-wide change is sparse" (p. 132). There is a "virtual absence of reported empirical data on how district leaders engage their organizations in fundamental reforms" (p. 133).

Further, there are those who proclaim that restructuring activity is for the purpose of satisfying the public that action is being taken to address their concerns about education. Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1990) make this observation about site-based management, one form of restructuring. Baldridge and Deal (1983) maintain that "large-scale intervention projects in schools [such projects are seen as changing roles and relationships] produce only limited measurable change, but they do increase

satisfaction, establish shared beliefs, and restore confidence and support among key constituencies" (p. 368).

Baldridge and Deal note further that a key feature of any change is to "reestablish illusions." Change is a set of "rituals, ceremonies, and signals that communicate or express myths and values to the world inside and outside an organization" (p. 367). In short, they observe, large-scale change efforts appear to produce only the illusion of change, rather than real change, but they observe that the illusion seems to be a kind of useful substitute.

In a somewhat similar vein, Osborne and Cochran (1992) recognize that educational organizations are complex and multifaceted, citing Leon Lessinger's metaphor of "messes." Lessinger explains that because organizations' programs are complex and interdependent, they cannot be addressed independently. Leaders, then, are no longer problem solvers; instead, they can only "manage messes," a term given to the current state of school change and reform efforts (Lessinger, cited by Osborne & Cochran, p. 15). Osborne and Cochran, however, in acknowledging the difficulties, suggest that what is needed is to look at the big picture and address the "whole of the organization" in a systems approach (p. 15).

Osborne and Cochran suggest that what is needed is to look at the big picture and address the "whole of the organization" in a systems approach (p. 15).

A challenging and reassuring note was provided also by William Boast, who maintained, in a keynote address, "Achieving Quality in Times of Change," (delivered February 12, 1992, at the conference The Evolving Process of Government in a World of Technological Change) that the reason for the existence of the hundreds of persons at the

conference was their role as leaders. That role was to make sense of managing and maintaining (or even increasing) the productivity of the organization, even in difficult and chaotic times. This hopeful view directs us to the positive side of the literature on restructuring.

On a Positive Note

Many writers believe that schools need to, and indeed can, change in major ways. David and Shields (1991) argue that increasing school effectiveness is "more complicated than researchers and policymakers imagined... [A]t the same time it is demonstrably possible, and knowledge of what it takes continues to expand" (p. 28). Cuban (1988) recommends "second-order change" (p. 342) that transforms (restructures) the school's old way of doing things into new ways that will solve problems. First-order change, which tries to improve on what exists without significant or substantial change, Cuban says, has permitted the school to remain ineffective in producing success for all students.

Schlechty states that schools are already doing as well as they can at what they do; thus we must try something different to achieve improvement.

Corbett (1990) argues that in order to achieve different, and better, results, the school will need to make changes in its rules, roles, and relationships. Schlechty, in an interview with Sparks (1991), agrees with the need and the definition, adding that restructuring "is **not** the same as school improvement, in which schools are expected to do better at what they are already doing" (p. 1). Schlechty states that schools are already doing as well as they can at what they do; thus we must try something different to achieve improvement. Further, leaders for schools must learn

to think about schools differently, develop new visions of what schools could be. "A compelling vision is so important ... [visions] are intended realities that suggest desired futures" (Schlechty & Cole, 1991, p. 79). What are the new visions that leaders will use to guide schools?

Outcomes for Students

To prepare students for the 21st century and beyond, a future that is expected to be quite different from the present, educators and their communities are rethinking their responsibilities. Yesterday's expectation of students was that they would learn to recall information; today and tomorrow students and all citizens will be required to perform complex tasks. For example, a school district in Colorado identified 19 outcomes for students, clustered in five categories that describe what each student will be expected to become: a self-directed learner, a collaborative worker, a complex thinker, a quality producer, and a community contributor (Redding, 1992). Similarly, as a result of extensive reviews of the literature, the North Central Regional Laboratory identified four characteristics of successful learners in our nation's schools (Jones & Fennimore, 1990):

Yesterday's expectation of students was that they would learn to recall information; today and tomorrow students and all citizens will be required to perform complex tasks.

- Knowledgeable. Successful learners use their acquired knowledge to think fluently and with authority, having a strong sense of what they believe and why; they are problem solvers and evaluators of information, reflecting on and puzzling about information.
- Self-determined. Successful learners are motivated and feel efficacious in determining their own

development; they believe in hard work and persevere with confidence when difficulties arise, assuming the world will provide opportunities and choices for their examination and action.

- Strategic. Successful students think about and control their own learning through their use of strategies for learning various subjects; they plan, organize, monitor, and summarize their learning, orchestrating these learning activities.
- Empathetic. Successful students see themselves and the world through the eyes of others, examining their own beliefs and those of others and sharing experiences to increase understanding and appreciation; they recognize the value of communicating with others, as well as developing a range of interpersonal skills to interact with and develop appreciation of multiple cultures.

These two sets of student outcomes are similar in many ways. It is clear in both that the emphasis is on *learning* rather than *teaching* and that the valuing of *self* in addition to *others* is basic to working together, as students help one another (Kohn, 1991). It is also clear that school leaders must give primary attention to outcomes as a way of thinking about how the school should do its work. Rethinking "fundamental changes in expectations for student learning, in the practice of teaching, and in the organization and management of public schools" is the current focus of educational reform (Elmore, 1990, p. 1).

It is also clear that school leaders must give primary attention to outcomes as a way of thinking about how the school should do its work.

Outcome-Driven Restructuring

Corbett (1990) and Schlechty (interviewed by Sparks, 1991) maintain that new results in schools are necessary and can occur only through restructuring. Corbett and Blum (1992), describing a model developed and refined by several of the federally funded regional educational laboratories in their collaborative restructuring project (see Figure 5), suggest that the *why* (outcomes) of improving schools precedes the *what* and the *how* and that the *why* should be embedded firmly in student outcomes. They also recommend community-wide involvement in identifying and establishing outcomes.

They also recommend community-wide involvement in identifying and establishing outcomes.

Figure 5. Thinking About Improving Schools

Student Outcomes	Transformed Teaching/Learning Situations	System Change
Why Restructure?		
	What Is Restructuring?	
		How Can Restructuring Happen?

Adapted from R. Blum & S.M. Hord (1992, March). *Restructuring for Results*. Presentation at Creating the Quality School Conference, Norman, OK.

If thinking about making schools more effective starts with students and their learnings, outcomes, or behaviors, then the next step is to consider and design teaching/learning situations that will produce the desired outcomes.

If thinking about making schools more effective starts with students and their learnings, outcomes, or behaviors, then the next step is to consider and design teaching/ learning situations that will produce the desired outcomes. If the desired outcomes are, or are similar to, those presented above (Redding, 1992; Jones & Fennimore, 1990), then school as usual will not be sufficient. A major redesign will be necessary to realize the new outcomes. As Corbett and Blum make clear, all subsequent changes must be demonstrably relevant to promoting these results. The organization and delivery of curriculum, the way students and teachers are arranged and scheduled, and the day-to-day teaching strategies, for example, are examined and redesigned with the outcomes firmly in mind. The key is understanding clearly what it is that students will be doing differently from what they have been doing before (Corbett & Blum, 1992).

The third part of such thinking takes its cue from the new teaching/learning situations; they dictate how the system must change to accommodate the new ways in which teaching and learning will occur. For instance, the method by which students are grouped for learning activities (classes) may not continue to use the typical strategy of chronological age. Scheduling for organizing "classes" and students' work may be quite different. "Classrooms" may be in the community, and parts of the community may become integrated with the school. Clearly, changes in structure, norms and values, governance — to name a few areas — will require consideration.

In all three dimensions of this way of thinking (outcomes, teaching/learning situations, system changes), roles, rules, and relationships will be re-created. Such change includes a reexamination of the roles of students, teachers, school- and district-level administrators, parents, community members, and the interrelationships among these groups. Such changes will be supported by new rules and policies. The key question is, "How do current rules, roles, and relationships have to change given the results a district wants to see?" (Corbett & Blum, 1992, p. 14). These two authors suggest that *unrestructuring* may be a needed first step so that new practices don't "get dumped on top of the residue of prior ones" (p. 15). In other words, there must be a plan for abandoning useless or dysfunctional practices that do not contribute to new outcomes.

If we are currently "managing messes," if we need a vast overhaul of schools by rethinking outcomes and their impact on teaching and learning, and if new teaching and learning processes in turn influence system factors, a major challenge looms before us. An immediate question is, Who will guide and support such changes? Thus, we are led back to the theme of facilitative leadership and the literature on restructuring and systemic change to gain insights about the roles of leaders.

An immediate question is, Who will guide and support such changes?

Again, the Need for Leaders

"Most children assume that knowledge just happens to them, that it is handed to them by some parentlike seer as if it

were a peanut butter and jelly sandwich" (Sizer, 1984, p. 3). This image is clearly not similar to that proposed in the foregoing section on restructuring for new student outcomes. If schools are to move from Sizer's image of imparting knowledge to passive students to that depicted by Jones and Fennimore (1990), in which students are engaged in the design and management of their own learning, major shifts must occur in the way schools operate and learning is organized.

Elmore (1992) suggests, "it is patently foolish to expect individual teachers to be able to learn and apply the ideas ... by themselves" (p. 46).

The key factor of the movement is the classroom teacher, and as Elmore (1992) suggests, "it is patently foolish to expect individual teachers to be able to learn and apply the ideas ... by themselves" (p. 46). In studying and critiquing the New Futures Experience, which attempted systemic change in behalf of disadvantaged youth, Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman (1992) observed that teachers need to be supported in their efforts with extensive staff development activities. One of their conclusions is that leadership is essential to the process of holistic school change, so that such needs are provided for.

It may seem redundant to make the point again about the need for leadership. However, the abundant publications and presentations on shared or participatory decision making, and school- or site-based management, seem to have led many educational practitioners to assume that leadership should become diffused, not highly visible, and not well identified as responsibilities for particular persons (personal communications with workshop participants, 1991 & 1992). As we shall see, the need for persons to fill the role and

functions of leaders continues to be a requirement in the restructuring efforts of the nineties.

In his assessment of the essentiality of leadership, Murphy (1991b) maintains that "the one substance area where change efforts converge is ... leadership" (p. 54). This is not surprising, Murphy says, because leadership is "the coin of the realm in virtually all reform reports" (p. 54). Changes of practice can best be nurtured by leadership (Wehlage et al., 1992) and some writers believe that realizing systemic change is akin to what leaders already know about implementing multiple, intertwined school improvement efforts, with the caveat that restructuring is "incredibly more massive and complex" (Harvey & Crandall, 1988, p. 15).

This is not surprising, Murphy says, because leadership is "the coin of the realm in virtually all reform reports" (p. 54).

Similarly, Anderson (1991) observes that since effective schools projects typically were constituted of multiple innovations, principals' roles in the context of such multiple change efforts provide understandings that can be translated to the development and emergence of broad-based leadership for restructuring projects. There are efforts under way already to ascertain how the effective schools correlates, "leadership and monitoring, will change as the ... structures of schools are altered" (Murphy, 1992, p. 93). We enter this new era of reform with considerably more organizational, political, and technical sophistication than we have had heretofore, but Horsley, Terry, Hergert, and Loucks-Horsley (1991) remind us that change is technically simple and socially complex.

Schlechty and Cole (1991) explain that leaders must market a compelling vision to keep intended realities and desired futures before people.

One of the actions of such leadership focuses on vision. Schlechty and Cole (1991) explain that leaders must market a compelling vision to keep intended realities and desired futures before people. Leaders need a clear grasp of the nature of the change to be implemented. Wehlage and colleagues (1992) reflect on the weaknesses of the New Futures Experience and conclude that there was not a clear enough vision of how schools might be different. A more precise vision, unlike leaders' actions in the eighties, proceeds from a top-down/bottom-up process of interaction and mutual influence between official leaders and practitioners. This process supports shared meanings and "sharpens the collective educational vision" (Wehlage et al., 1992, p. 84).

In addition to the leaders' actions for *developing vision and its communication*, cited above by Schlechty and Cole (1991) and Wehlage (1992), there are other actions taken by leaders in restructuring efforts. Case studies comparing a principal in New Mexico with one in England report about the principals in restructuring their schools' decision-making and governance procedures (Hord & Poster, in press). They were active in *establishing a new atmosphere* and approach for improvement through encouraging staff in new norms: reading research, reflecting, and studying together. They made clear to their faculties that change would require time, and they arranged for this important resource. They were engaged in *providing a supportive environment* that included both human and material resources, establishing a climate that was conducive to change efforts.

These restructuring leaders used time also in *reteaching staff* and allowing them to *re-experience learning processes* for decision making and problem solving. They did not assume that one shot at learning new procedures would be adequate. Thus, *monitoring progress* toward the vision was another activity exemplified by these principals. They also monitored themselves and their changing roles and behaviors. Last, they were quite busy *making midcourse adjustments* based on their findings from monitoring the school's efforts. These restructuring projects originated from the identification of new outcomes for students: developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills. New roles and relationships in both schools developed between teachers and students and between teachers and administrators. And in one school parents took on new roles.

The six types of principals' leadership for restructuring in these cases conform to the categories reviewed in section two of this paper. However, various writers suggest that an additional perspective on leadership is needed for restructuring.

However, various writers suggest that an additional perspective on leadership is needed for restructuring.

Tranformational Leadership: From Push to Pull

Most efforts at restructuring, Leithwood (1992b) suggests, include some alterations of the existing power relationships in districts and schools. These may center on site-based decision making and management, increased parent and community involvement in curricular and instructional decisions, and others. These new power and control alignments in schools are following similar shifts in business

and industry, based on power that is "consensual ... a form of power manifested *through* other people, not *over* other people" (Leithwood, 1992b, p. 9). To achieve change and improvement in schools there must be a balance of top-down and facilitative forms of power; "finding the right balance is the problem" (Leithwood, 1992b, p. 9). School leaders must use facilitative power to transform their schools; such leaders do this, Leithwood (1992b) says, by

- helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative professional school culture
- fostering teacher development
- helping staff solve problems together more effectively. (p. 9-10)

Thus, one new view of leadership envisions leaders more as human resource developers and less as administrators in positions of authority who direct various tasks to be done (Reavis & Griffith, 1992).

Thus, one new view of leadership envisions leaders more as human resource developers and less as administrators in positions of authority who direct various tasks to be done (Reavis & Griffith, 1992). Rather than telling, pushing, and driving the organization, the leader expects the highest possible from each staff person, gets commitment, and works with individual staff in a personalized, goal-setting way. "They provide an environment that promotes individual contributions to the organization's work" (Méndez-Morse, 1992, in press). Bennis and Nanus (1985), from their study of exemplary corporate leaders, describe this process by saying that leaders "pull," rather than push. They pull through a compelling vision that creates focus for the organization and leads to an intensive plan of action for the leader.

Leaders establish the vision in the system's members and simultaneously nurture the organization to foster additional "pull" leadership. This can happen, Kanter's study of "change masters" reveals, if the organization is one that is integrated as a whole and not segmented into parts (Kanter, 1983). Schools, however, have been described as loosely coupled organizations (Weick, 1982), with various grade levels and academic departments, for example, poorly connected to each other.

One of the strategies of systemic change is involving all parts of the school organization, thus working toward integration. Through such organization, the participants gain power in a series of steps, the purposes of the leader and the staff become fused, the leader exercises pull, and the staff members are motivated to try out their ideas. An additional dimension to the new leadership model is the making of decisions based on high moral values supported by harmony, coherence, and "social justice and caring" (Murphy, 1992, p. 100). It is "a deep commitment to principle, to enduring values, to people — all the people served by the organization" (Reavis & Griffith, 1992, p. 25).

An additional dimension to the new leadership model is the making of decisions based on high moral values supported by harmony, coherence, and "social justice and caring" (Murphy, 1992, p. 100).

Permission for Passion

Others also have described leadership that subscribes to and is directed by moral authority, what may be thought of as "higher order leadership" (M.W. McGhee, personal communication, May 23, 1992). In this mode, Sergiovanni (1990a) describes value-added leadership that emphasizes enhancing meaning about tasks rather than manipulating

people, enabling staff to do their work rather than giving them directions, leading with passion instead of calculation, and developing collegial relationships rather than congeniality. Barth (1990) distinguishes between congeniality and collegiality; "congeniality suggests people getting along ... friendly, cordial ... enjoying each other's company" (p. 30). For a definition of collegiality, Barth borrows from Little (1981) and reports her four collegial behaviors: "adults in school *talk about practice ... observe each other* engaged in [their] practice ... *work on curriculum ... teach each other* (Barth, 1990, p. 31). It could be said that congeniality is person-focused and collegiality is task-focused.

*Sergiovanni (1990b) describes leaders who push **and** pull, who are both ahead of and behind the staff.*

Based on his work with many leaders in many schools, Sergiovanni (1990b) describes leaders who push **and** pull, who are both ahead of and behind the staff. Brandt (1992) quotes Sergiovanni, who describes this leader as being a "better follower: better at articulating the purposes of the community; more passionate about them, more willing to take time to pursue them" (p. 47). Such leaders are constantly leading and prodding, and practice leadership by outrage, if necessary.

Sergiovanni explains outrage. He cites three sources of leadership authority and reports that in bureaucratic organizations with leadership based in bureaucratic "command" authority, leaders are expected to be cold and calculating. When the source of leadership is psychological authority, the leader must be sensitive to others' interpersonal needs, which can make the leader's behavior condescending — treating people like children. But, if

leadership is directed by moral authority, the leader can "behave normally ... get angry, and be disappointed ... treating [people] much more authentically ... if you're not pleased with something ... say so" (Brandt, 1992, p. 46).

These leaders bring a sense of passion and risk, symbolizing to others that anything worth believing in is worth being passionate about. These leaders care deeply enough to show passion and when quality is not achieved, that passion often takes the form of outrage.

The emphasis on high quality is an organizational value, and leaders achieve quality within the culture of the organization by rewarding it, exhibiting it, and supporting those who hold out for it. Quality must be a core value if staff are to have pride in the system. Pride, then, is the guardian of quality. Quality is produced by people, and it is the centrality of concern for people that Peters and Austin (1985) found in their study of excellent companies. Such leaders exhibit a "bone-deep" commitment to everyone in the organization. To foster risk taking, leaders communicate and demonstrate that it is okay for anyone to make a mistake.

The emphasis on high quality is an organizational value, and leaders achieve quality within the culture of the organization by rewarding it, exhibiting it, and supporting those who hold out for it.

Leaders with passion and a quest for quality stress continuous learning (Reavis & Griffith, 1992). They are learners themselves, and they expect their staff to be learners as well. There is a growing interest in having schools become learning organizations where learning is extended to all levels of the school — not just to students, but to teachers, administrators, and all staff (Senge & Lannon-Kim, 1991). This idea was earlier proposed by Barth (1986) when he

Leaders with passion and a quest for quality stress continuous learning (Reavis & Griffith, 1992). They are learners themselves, and they expect their staff to be learners as well.

described school learning communities, administered by the head learner, the principal.

Senge (1990) has specified the capacities that individuals and the organization collectively will need to become a learning organization.

Senge (1990), basing his views on his work in the corporate sector and on the "seminal works of David Bohm and Chris Argyris" (p. 412), has specified the capacities that individuals and the organization collectively will need to become a learning organization. Five disciplines, or ways of thinking and interacting in the organization, represent these capacities. The first is *systems thinking*, a means of seeing wholes, recognizing patterns and interrelationships, and being able to structure the interrelationships more effectively. This discipline integrates the other four, fusing them into a coherent body.

Building shared vision is the practice of articulating compelling images of what an organization wants to create, sharing pictures of the future that foster genuine commitment. *Personal mastery* is the skill of continually clarifying and deepening personal vision, identifyng what each individual wants in his/her personal life. Senge asserts that without personal visions there can be no shared vision.

Using *mental models* involves distinguishing what has actually been observed from assumptions and generalizations based on the observations. It involves holding assumptions up to the world for scrutiny and making them open to the influence of others. Last, *team learning* is the capacity to think together through dialogue and discussion. Developing team learning skills involves each individual's balancing

inquiry and advocacy to achieve decision making that is collaborative.

To create and sustain a learning organization, leaders will need to construct environments in which people are continually increasing their capacity to shape their future. For leaders, the challenge is to turn the basic human drive to learn into a shared vision that is compelling for all members of the organization. They build a culture in which ideas are expected to be tried out. It is not yet clear how school leaders must act to develop learning organizations, but schools are working with this concept (Senge & Lannon-Kim, 1991). Their experiences may provide illumination — hopefully soon.

For leaders, the challenge is to turn the basic human drive to learn into a shared vision that is compelling for all members of the organization.

To Foster Restructuring

Which styles of leadership are best suited for school restructuring? This question is difficult to address because so few school districts have studied their own restructuring efforts, and those that have, have not been engaged in the exercise for a sufficient amount of time to have achieved enlightening results (Reavis & Griffith, 1992). "Researchers are only beginning ... to explore the meaning and utility of [transformational] leadership in schools, and very little empirical evidence is available about its nature and consequences in such contexts" (Leithwood, 1992b, p. 9). However, in a survey of districts that were engaged in restructuring, Reavis used a 44-item questionnaire of educational leader skills from professional organizations. In

this study to understand factors of leadership for restructuring, the 44 questionnaire items were rated by those leaders of 17 districts that were implementing restructuring (Reavis & Griffith, 1992, p. 27). The nine highest-rated items were

- knowledge of change management — the highest-rated requirement for school restructuring
- collaborative leadership style
- team building
- educational values
- high moral purpose/sense of purpose
- knowledge of curriculum and instruction
- a sound, well-reasoned philosophy
- knowledge of climate/culture and how to change/shape them
- sensitivity.

A key to understanding these needs of leaders is the assumption ascribed to leaders' actions for restructuring: Restructuring requires a holistic approach to change; a total plan for change must be developed with the involvement of all aspects of the organization. Thus, change management (i.e., leadership) must be considered in the context of large-scale, systemic change. To be operational, these factors must be translated into skills and behaviors.

Thus, change management (i.e., leadership) must be considered in the context of large-scale, systemic change.

The LEAD Restructuring Study Group in a Select Seminar (1989) identified skills or competencies that restructuring leaders need. Those skills related to

- visionary leadership — understanding change and the change process, developing a picture of an improved state of the organization, encouraging creativity, and managing operations in relationship to student learning
- cultural leadership — using situational leadership, recognizing organizational culture and norms, shaping norms to support collegial practice, diminishing norms that destroy the organization's vision
- symbolic leadership — promoting public relations and communicating in every way the importance of the organization's programs
- instructional leadership — understanding curriculum, instruction, and student learning and using research and evaluation data to improve the system
- reflective practice — providing and receiving performance assessment, and considering past and current practice with the goal of improving the organization's work
- creating work force norms that support collegiality — developing and using group process, team building, trust building, and other facilitating and collaborative processes
- creating leadership density — recognizing potential leaders and developing their growth
- identifying leverage points -- recognizing "windows of opportunity" and taking advantage of them to improve student outcomes.

Visionary leadership — understanding change and the change process, developing a picture of an improved state of the organization

Creating work force norms that support collegiality

Students of restructuring emphasize that radically different schools require radically different leaders.

Students of restructuring emphasize that radically different schools require radically different leaders. Mojkowski (1991) reports on a prescription for restructuring leadership that is a "rare blend of the heroic and mundane, of lofty ideal and pragmatic realism, it is a courageous and imaginative foray into the future" (p. iii). Mojkowski and the LEAD Restructuring Study Group reconceptualized the leadership role, calling for "persuasive and systematic concentration of the leaders' and others' efforts, engaging the organization in developing and implementing educational outcomes that are sophisticated and worthy" (p. 26). Because restructuring calls for powerful personal and technical skills, as well as the character and will to support others on a day-to-day basis, leaders will "lead with [their] hearts as often as [they] follow [their] plans" (p. 28).

How does such leadership look? The following outlines Mojkowski's and the Study Group's (1991) perspective:

Create dissonance. Leaders press for change and improvement by regularly reminding staff and others of the vision they hold for children and of the shortfalls in current attainment.

- Create dissonance. Leaders press for change and improvement by regularly reminding staff and others of the vision they hold for children and of the shortfalls in current attainment. They report on current actions and accomplishments of all involved constituents to indicate that the vision has not been reached.

- Prepare for and create opportunities. They seize opportunities in creative ways that will move the school closer to accomplishing their mission. They quickly access material and human resources that

might support the school's goal attainment. They ignore possibilities that do not promise the desired result.

- Forge connections and create interdependencies. They "unstructure" nonproductive arrangements and barriers that keep people disconnected. They remodel classroom space to open up "the boxes" that keep staff isolated. They create new roles and responsibilities, pulling people together both inside and outside the school, orchestrating interdependencies. They create vertical teams and cross-discipline or cross-grade committees to work on school projects. Such relationships contribute to the understanding and action necessary for restructuring.

- Encourage risk taking. Leaders support people in taking risks and try to minimize their discomfort with making mistakes. They understand that mistakes will occur and support people in learning from their mistakes. They protect the staff as they learn to become risk takers.

Encourage risk taking. Leaders support people in taking risks and try to minimize their discomfort with making mistakes.

- Follow as well as lead. Leaders nurture leadership activities in all the staff, leading through service and providing support.

- Use information. Leaders use a broad array of student and organizational data. They communicate clearly and share information in

multiple ways. They think about new assessment processes to measure learner productivity and growth. They use research and practice information in considering innovation and change, and they check progress and maintain records about the implementation process.

Foster the long view. Leaders go for the long-term yields, knowing when to exercise patience and withhold judgment.

- Foster the long view. Leaders go for the long-term yields, knowing when to exercise patience and withhold judgment. They employ strategic direction, use their sense of mission, and are guided by their vision of learners and learning. This highly skilled facilitative leader moves "incrementally within a comprehensive design" (p. 29).

- Acquire resources. Acquisition and distribution of resources are managed with finesse. Leaders solicit funding through competitive grants and from the business community. They reallocate resources in relationship to staff's readiness and resistance. They "find time for staff to plan and develop" (p. 30).

- Negotiate for win-win outcomes. They use collective bargaining processes constructively with teacher representatives, creating agreements that target the teaching and learning process. They accomplish this through organizing study groups, providing persuasive literature focused on instruction and student gains, and engaging

teacher representatives to lead discussions. They exhibit patience but also perseverance.

- Provide stability in change. They practice organized abandonment of elements that are dysfunctional or unnecessary. With the staff, they review curriculum and instruction guides to identify activities and materials for discard. They protect the school and staff as they experiment and take risks; they hold central office and others "at bay" so as not to overload the staff with unnecessary or low-priority items. They provide order and direction in the uncertain and changing environment.

- Grow people while getting the work accomplished. They nurture promising candidates for leadership in order to ensure that restructuring will continue beyond their tenure. They invest heavily in staff development and help staff move beyond their own experience. They organize self-managing and self-learning groups.

Includes the leadership categories cited in the previous section: creating an atmosphere and culture for change, developing the vision, allocating resources, providing training and staff development, monitoring progress, providing for continuing assistance.

This depiction of leadership includes the leadership categories cited in the previous section: creating an atmosphere and culture for change, developing the vision, allocating resources, providing training and staff development, monitoring progress, providing for continuing assistance. As can be seen, however, the actions of leaders for restructuring go beyond the six categories, with their day-to-day leadership tasks grounded in and expressed from a

deep commitment to collaborative action and shared decision making.

This leadership cares deeply about and for individuals in the system, providing the human interface in personalized ways that stem not only from the mind but from the heart as well.

This leadership cares deeply about and for individuals in the system, providing the human interface in personalized ways that stem not only from the mind but from the heart as well. Reavis and Griffith (1992) depict the new leader as one who is comfortable in working with others in a nonhierarchical fashion, with no need to stand on positional authority. This leader is a risk taker while tolerating ambiguity, not knowing exactly how everything will develop. Such leaders "trust the strength of others and value their efforts and contributions in the realization of the organization's vision" (Méndez-Morse, 1992, in press). The new leadership is grounded in a vision of "leaders" rather than the vision of "a leader."

While such leaders are providing the leadership for changing the system and the relationships of its people, parts, and functions, they are also restructuring their own roles in the system. For as Murphy (1991a) states, changing the conditions of teaching and learning means also changing the conditions of leadership. This was clearly revealed in the changes examined in the case study of one principal's restructuring story (Hord & Poster, in press). In this study, new outcomes for students to increase their critical thinking and problem-solving abilities were driving the classroom teachers' change of instructional practice.

To design the new teaching/learning conditions, new structures for teacher and administrator planning and

decision making were created. This necessitated the formation of new relationships of the principal with the teachers — a challenging and sometimes difficult personal change for the principal. It seems reasonable to expect that new relationships required in restructuring efforts will test the mettle and emotional resources of many leaders as they develop new roles. A brief look at anticipated role and relationship changes for leaders follows.

New Roles for Old

An important aspect of what leaders do in restructuring is the transformations or changes that they make in their own roles. Role changes will occur at all levels: state, local board of education, superintendent, central office, principal, teacher, and parent.

An important aspect of what leaders do in restructuring is the transformations or changes that they make in their own roles.

According to Michael Cohen (an observer of education reform for many years at the National Institute of Education, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and currently the National Governors' Association), *governors and other state officials* can wield influence through use of the "bully pulpit to focus public attention and mobilize support ... to influence the political climate and culture of local school districts" (Cohen, 1990, p. 275). In the process they give up much of their power and signal its transfer to the local level. The state role will become threefold, according to Cohen.

In the process they give up much of their power and signal its transfer to the local level.

The state, first, will set long-range educational goals and standards for student outcomes and link these to assessments for higher-order skills, not minimum-competency tests. The

state must ensure that the assessments do not greatly impact or restrain local-level decisions in curriculum and instructional choices. They must act so that the school's increased autonomy is not unduly affected.

Second, the state must be encouraging by stimulating local innovation. A greater variety of curricular and instructional arrangements, and ways to organize teachers for greater collegial interaction, for example, will need sanction and support by state policies. The state will also need to reduce administrative and regulatory barriers so that experimentation and improvement can occur.

Third, at the state level, consideration will be required in accountability systems. Rather than establishing necessary inputs for local education systems, state policymakers will set outcome standards designed to hold both the school and the district accountable for results. Focusing on these issues will fundamentally change roles and relationships of the state with the local level.

The local school board spends much of its time on crisis management or operational details and little on systematic planning, policy development, or oversight (Cohen, 1990).

The *local school board* spends much of its time on crisis management or operational details and little on systematic planning, policy development, or oversight (Cohen, 1990). Local boards must develop long-range goals, attract and retain high-quality personnel, assure that resources are adequately targeted to students with the greatest need, and make it possible for success at the school level to happen. Fullan (1991) points out the obvious, and critical, need for boards to give careful attention to the search for and selection of superintendents who are capable of leading change.

Oversight by the board will be necessary to ascertain if goals are being accomplished and policies are producing their intended effects; boards will also need to be strong advocates for education and youth (Cohen, 1990). Murphy (1991a) notes that board member's roles may not be greatly altered, but their understandings and views of the ways administrators and teachers function may need major revision. Boards, philosophically, must be in agreement with the purposes of restructuring if school staffs and parents can succeed in their efforts to redesign schools.

Currently, the Institute for Educational Leadership is completing a study of the school board's role in restructuring. The researchers are attempting to learn how the role of boards may have changed and to identify relevant issues that boards have faced in reform efforts (Pipho, 1992).

The *superintendent's* role may change dramatically. The chief executive becomes a coordinator and enabler, to serve and assist schools, paying more attention to "unheroic dimensions of leadership" (Murphy, 1991a, p. 25). These executives will promote local autonomy and professionalism, tapping the leadership of teachers (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992). They start with a personal vision and work with all constituencies to find a shared vision. They provide leadership, but also nurture the development of leadership, relying on others (Murphy, 1991b; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992).

The chief executive becomes a coordinator and enabler, to serve and assist schools, paying more attention to "unheroic dimensions of leadership" (Murphy, 1991a, p. 25).

"Understanding of how superintendents lead the decentralization of entire school systems remains primitive at best" (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992, p. 137). The chief executive must symbolize commitment and the importance of restructuring, overcome barriers, and give attention to opposition (Hill & Bonan, 1991). Only the chief executive can assure those at the local level that they will be supported in new roles and that when things go wrong, they will not have to return to the old centralized system. The superintendent abandons the exercise of command and control and makes it clear that the desired procedure is to take risks, correct mistakes, and find ways to make change work at the local school (Hill & Bonan, 1991).

The superintendent abandons the exercise of command and control and makes it clear that the desired procedure is to take risks, correct mistakes, and find ways to make change work at the local school (Hill & Bonan, 1991).

Such leadership appears to be transformational and suggests "directions for future research on the leadership practices of superintendents for school improvement" (Leithwood, 1992a, p. 177). Of all the things that superintendents must do, however, the most pervasive feature that directs their actions is their effort to influence school performance (Mitchell & Tucker, 1992). This factor also permeates the work of central office in their school-change work.

At the *central office level* leaders will decentralize and establish school-level governance structures, such as a school council composed of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members, to take on functions that were formerly enacted at the district level. Importantly, districts must determine the latitude of authority for the school councils and

the degree of influence given to the teachers and parents (Cohen, 1990; Fullan, 1991).

District staff may need to consider with school councils new means of assigning staff and students to schools. And districts' teacher appraisal systems should focus on how well they "make appropriate instructional decisions and judgments in order to accomplish results with their [particular] students" (Cohen, 1990, p. 269). In all cases, less authority and autonomy will be vested at the district level, as it is shifting to the school level. "Central office administrators ... [will] reorient their roles toward service and support and away from hierarchical supervision and compliance monitoring" (Hallinger & Edwards, 1992, p. 135), getting ready to become "facilitators" (p. 143).

As Reavis and Griffith (1992) suggest, the central office role will change from monitoring for compliance with district-level policies to acting as support to assist schools in their improvement efforts.

As Reavis and Griffith (1992) suggest, the central office role will change from monitoring for compliance with district-level policies to acting as support to assist schools in their improvement efforts. Rather than being the source of all ideas for change, central office staff will serve as a resource to schools in their change initiatives.

The principal's role is likely to change from middle manager in the district organization to that of facilitator-leader for his or her school (Murphy, 1991a; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992).

The relationship that is likely to be most changed in restructuring activities is that of *principal* and teachers. The principal must accept additional autonomy and accountability on behalf of the school and subsequently transfer it to the staff and parents or larger community. The principal's role is likely to change from middle manager in the district organization to that of facilitator-leader for his or her school

(Murphy, 1991a; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992). This shift will make the principal's role more complex, requiring more effort in working between the school and the district office, and between the school and the community. Murphy's review of the literature (1991a) led him to conclude that principals will place more emphasis on three areas:

- technical core operations (becoming the curriculum leader and managing the school's teaching/learning strategies, conditions, operations)
- people management (working to develop participatory leadership and mediate shared governance)
- school-environmental relations (interacting with the wider community and developing connections between the school and the environment).

Murphy (1991a) declares that in restructuring, the real heroes are not the positional leaders who traditionally have been at the top of the organization chart but the professionals and parents who interact directly with students.

Murphy (1991a) declares that in restructuring, the real heroes are not the positional leaders who traditionally have been at the top of the organization chart but the *professionals* and parents who interact directly with students. There is broad understanding about the underutilization of teachers' knowledge, skills, and ideas in the past, and restructuring typically changes this situation. Efforts to change schools in systemic ways will include a reconceptualization of the roles and responsibilities of teachers.

Assuming that leadership is better connected to expertise than to line authority, the redesign of teachers' work rests on the premise that teachers are intellectuals and should take leadership in discussing the nature and purposes of schools.

Further, teaching should be guided by professionals rather than by bureaucratic regulations. These propositions argue for expanded responsibilities and a stronger role for teachers in decision making.

Parents too will have new opportunities to provide ideas and contribute to the schooling discussion. Responsibilities will be less role-dependent as schools begin to appreciate and acknowledge the interest and expertise of parents. Parents will participate in the school's efforts to connect with the community and the larger environment as they take on activities that go beyond the bake sale (Henderson, Marburger, & Ooms, 1986). Watkins, Cox, Owen, and Burkhardt (1992), supported by their review of research on change, maintain that a multiconstituency team, a team representing all major constituencies, is most able to address the problems of systemic change in a strategic way. Certainly, parents are a very invested constituent and have major interest in schools.

Parents too will have new opportunities to provide ideas and contribute to the schooling discussion.

Concluding This Section

In this section, using student outcomes as the basis for designing and planning systemic change or restructuring efforts has been urged. Assuming that identifying new outcomes for learners is a first step, it follows that new teaching and learning situations will be needed to realize those outcomes. Further, system changes will be required to support the new learning conditions.

Images of the leadership needed to bring such plans into reality have been briefly described, and the behaviors of such leaders with "mind and heart" were specified. How leaders' roles will also be restructured was suggested. The research to date on restructuring efforts, including purposes and intentions, effects hoped for, leaders' actions in guiding and supporting these endeavors, and outcomes realized are thin at best. What is needed are longitudinal, in-depth studies to illuminate understanding of the factors enumerated. Such results could inform leaders in planning for restructuring and in implementation of their plans.

What is needed are longitudinal, in-depth studies to illuminate understanding of the factors enumerated.

In Conclusion

There is nothing more difficult to execute,
nor more dubious of success, nor more dangerous to administer
than to introduce a new order of things.

— N. Machiavelli, 1984, p. 21

An initial issue addressed in this paper is the assumption by educators at all levels that change in schools and the entire educational system will happen quite naturally because a particular change is deemed to be "a good thing." The "goodness theory," over the decades, has proven inadequate. Even when power is added to the equation through mandated policy from national, state, and/or district levels, little change finds its way into schools and classrooms. Despite the lack of change resulting from these prevailing assumptions, the assumptions continue to be employed by many educational leaders seeking improvement.

The "goodness theory," over the decades, has proven inadequate.

What emerges from a review of change efforts, both those successful and unsuccessful, is the presence or absence respectively of person(s) who assist others in the adoption and implementation of plans for change. This "human interface" was revealed as a significant factor in evaluations of early knowledge dissemination and utilization programs. Persons who could link innovations and users, and provide

What emerges from a review of change efforts, both those successful and unsuccessful, is the presence or absence respectively of person(s) who assist others in the adoption and implementation of plans for change.

implementation help and assistance, were noted in the change literature as a necessary condition for success.

Of these change agents, some external and some internal to the system, none were given the amount of attention and reporting space as school principals. They became the heroes and heroines of schools that had "turned themselves around." Significant research studies were conducted to learn about their work and to identify their strategies. Out of these studies of principals and their colleagues, who frequently formed a shared leadership for change, came six categories of actions taken to assist the change process:

- Creating an atmosphere and culture for change
- Developing and communicating the vision
- Planning and providing resources
- Providing training and development
- Monitoring and checking progress
- Continuing to give assistance.

Furthermore, studies of districts successful in change revealed that superintendents and their colleagues engaged the same strategies. Thus, it seems appropriate to conclude that we know a great deal about how to plan for, guide, and assist school change. And, in such endeavors, a key factor persists — the need for facilitative leaders who assume responsibility for effecting change. Moreover, it is clear that while positional leaders are important to the change process, it is people who demonstrate functional leadership that make a difference. In other words, anyone in any position can be a

And, in such endeavors, a key factor persists — the need for facilitative leaders who assume responsibility for effecting change.

facilitative leader who functions to supply the actions and strategies needed to effect change.

Will this legacy work in current restructuring efforts?

Restructuring is a new way of thinking about educational reform. Restructuring is, importantly, stimulated by highly challenging outcomes for students that will prepare them to meet the world of today and tomorrow. Research and experience suggest that these outcomes cannot be accomplished by improving upon what schools are currently doing. These outcomes will require a holistic approach, engaging the entire system. Such systemic change addresses all parts of the interconnected education enterprise.

Restructuring is, importantly, stimulated by highly challenging outcomes for students that will prepare them to meet the world of today and tomorrow.

Leaders who respond to this challenge can take advantage of what is known about facilitating change. They can understand and build on lessons from the change models of the past and their faulty assumptions. They can build on the knowledge base gained from the experiences of yesterday's leaders who achieved change and improvement in their schools. And today's leaders can incorporate the early findings of those who are pioneering in restructuring efforts.

Leaders who respond to this challenge can take advantage of what is known about facilitating change.

Finally, but foremost, all leaders of educational change and improvement can focus on results in behalf of children and young people, especially those most at risk in our current society. What more worthy purpose could there be?

Bibliography

Anderson, S.E. (1991). Principal's management style and patterns of teacher implementation across multiple innovations. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(4), 286-304.

Baldridge, J.V. & Deal, T. (1983). Drama and culture: The symbolic aspects of change. In J.V. Baldridge & T. Deal (Eds.), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (pp. 367-371). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Barth, R.S. (1986). The principalship. *Educational Leadership, 42*(6), 92-94.

Barth, R.S. (1988, May). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(9), 639-642.

Barth, R.S. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beer, M., Eisenstat, R.A., & Spector, B. (1990, November-December). Why change programs don't produce change. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(6), 158-166.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Their strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Vol. 8. Implementing and sustaining innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Block, P. (1987). *The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bossert, T., Dwyer, D.C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G.V. (1982, Summer). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(3), 34-64.

Boyd, V. (1992). *School context: Bridge or barrier for change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Brandt, R. (1987). On leadership and student achievement: A conversation with Richard Andrews. *Educational Leadership, 45*(1), 9-16.

Brandt, R. (1992). On rethinking leadership: A conversation with Tom Sergiovanni. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 46-49.

Buck, J.T. (1989). *Transformational leadership behaviors of exemplary Texas superintendents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper.

Bush, R.N. (1984). Effective staff development. *Making our schools more effective: Proceedings of three state conferences* (pp. 223-238). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Carson, C.C., Huelskamp, R.M., & Woodall, T.D. (1991). *Perspective on education in America*. Albuquerque, NM: Sandia National Laboratories.

Cawelti, G. (1987). Why instructional leaders are so scarce. *Educational Leadership, 45*(1), 3.

Charters, W.W., Jr. & Jones, J.E. (1973, November). On the risk of appraising non-events in program evaluation. *Educational Researcher, 2*(11), 5-7.

Chin, R. & Benne, K.D. (1969). General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. In W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.), *The planning of change* (2nd ed.) (pp. 32-59). Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Cohen, M. (1987). Improving school effectiveness: Lessons from research. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 474-490). New York: Longman.

Cohen, M. (1990). Key issues confronting state policy makers. In R.F. Elmore (Ed.), *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform* (pp. 251-288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Coléman, P. & LaRocque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be good enough: Administrative practices and school district ethos*. London: The Falmer Press.

Corbett, H.D. (1990). *On the meaning of restructuring*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Corbett, H.D. & Blum, R.E. (1992). *Thinking backwards to move forward*. Unpublished manuscript. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Crandall, D.P. (1977). Training and supporting linking agents. In N. Nash & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts, and applications* (pp. 189-274). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Crandall, D. et al. (1982). *People, policies, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement*. Andover, MA: The NETWORK.

Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(1), 28-30.

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 341-344.

Culbertson, J. & Nash, N. (1977). Introduction. In N. Nash & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts, and applications* (pp. 1-5). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

David, J.L. & Shields, P.M. (1991, August). *From effective schools to restructuring: A literature review*. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Deal, T.E. (1990). Foreword. In T. Sergiovanni, *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools* (pp. v-ix). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Deal, T.E. & Peterson, K.D. (1990). *The principal's role in shaping school culture*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

DeBevoise, W. (1984, February). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership, 41*(5), 14-20.

Doyle, W.J. (1978). A solution in search of a problem: Comprehensive change and the Jefferson Experimental Schools. In D. Mann (Ed.), *Making change happen?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Duttweiler, P.C. & Hord, S.M. (1987). *Dimensions of effective leadership*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Edmonds, R.R. (1979, October). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*(2), 15-24.

Elmore, R.F. (1990). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elmore, R.F. (1992, April). Why restructuring alone won't improve teaching. *Educational Leadership, 49*(7), 44-48.

Emrick, J.A. & Peterson, S.M. (1978). *A synthesis of findings across five recent studies in educational dissemination and change.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Engel, D.E. (1990). Pittsburgh's teacher-administrator partnership: A new relationship. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 44-45.

Fullan, M.G. (1985, January). Change processes and strategies at the local level. *The Elementary School Journal, 85*(3), 391-422.

Fullan, M.G. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), *Changing school culture through staff development* (pp. 3-25). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Fullan, M.G. (1992). Visions that blind. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 19-20.

Fullan, M.G. (with Stiegelbauer, S.M.) (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gabbett, P. (1991, September 24). U.S. education OK, Sandia Lab report says. *Albuquerque Journal*, p. A1.

Gardner, J.W. (1990). *On leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981). *Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students.* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Getzels, J.W. & Guba, E.G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *School Review, 65*, 423-441.

Glatter, R. (1987). The role of school leaders in the introduction of school improvement. In N.E. Stego, K. Gielen, R. Glatter, & S.M. Hord (Eds.), *The role of school leaders in school improvement* (pp. 49-70). Leuven, Belgium: ACCO.

Goodlad, J.I. (1975). *The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. (1986). *Configurations of school-based leadership teams.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hall, G.E., Wallace, R.C., & Dossett, W.A. (1973). *A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hallinger, P. & Edwards, M.A. (1992). The paradox of superintendent leadership in school restructuring. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3*(2), 131-149.

Hansen, J.M. & Smith, R. (1989). Building-based instructional improvement: The principal as an instructional leader. *NASSP Bulletin, 73*(518), 10-16.

Harvey, G. & Crandall, D.P. (1988). A beginning look at the what and how of restructuring. In C.L. Jenks (Ed.), *The redesign of education: A collection of papers concerned with comprehensive educational reform* (pp. 3-37). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Havelock, R.G. (1971). *Planning for innovation through dissemination and utilization of knowledge.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Hayes, L. (1992, May). An urgent message goes unheeded. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(9), 724.

Henderson, A.T., Marburger, C.L., & Ooms, T. (1986). *Beyond the bake sale (An educator's guide to working with parents).* Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hill, P.T. & Bonan, J. (1991). *Decentralization and accountability in public education.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Hill, P.T., Wise, A.E., & Shapiro, L. (1989). *Educational progress: Cities mobilize to improve their schools.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.

Hood, P.D. (1982). *The role of linking agents in school improvement: A review, analysis, and synthesis of recent major studies.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Hord, S.M. (1987). *Evaluating educational innovation.* London: Croom Helm.

Hord, S.M. (1992). *Entering and exiting the superintendency: Preparation, promises, problems.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hord, S.M. & Huling-Austin, L. (1986). Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights. *The Elementary School Journal, 87*(1), 97-115.

Hord, S.M. & Poster, C. (in press). Restructuring schools: Lessons from school leaders. In C. Dimmock (Ed.), *School-based management: Ideas for school effectiveness and school improvement.* London: Routledge.

Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L. L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). *Taking charge of change.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Hord, S.M., Stiegelbauer, S.M., & Hall, G.E. (1984). How principals work with other change facilitators. *Education and Urban Society, 17*(1), 89-109.

Horsley, D.L., Terry, W., Hergert, L.F., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1991). *Managing change in rural schools: An action guide.* Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Horst, D.P., et al. (1975). *Evaluation of the field test of Project Information Packages: Volume II, Recommendations for revision.* Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corp.

House, E.R. (1981). Three perspectives on innovation. In R. Lehming and M. Kane (Eds.), *Improving schools: Using what we know* (pp. 17-41). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hoy, W.K. & Miskel, C.G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Random House.

Huberman, M. & Crandall, D. (1983). *People, policies, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement: Vol. 9. Implications for action, a study of dissemination efforts supporting school improvement.* Andover, MA: The NETWORK.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close.* New York: Plenum.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M. (1986). Rethinking the quest for school improvement: Some findings from the DESSI Study. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Rethinking school improvement* (pp. 61-81). New York: Teachers College Press.

Huff, S., Lake, D., & Schaalman, M. (1982). *Principal differences: Excellence in school leadership and management.* Boston: McBer.

Jacobson, S.L. (1986). *Administrative leadership and effective small-rural schools: A comparative case study.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, State University of New York & Ithaca College of Agriculture Life Sciences.

Johnston, J.A., Bickel, W.E., & Wallace, R.D., Jr. (1990). Building and sustaining change in the culture of secondary schools. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 46-48.

Jones, B.F. & Fennimore, T.F. (1990). Videoconference 1: The new definition of learning: The first step to school reform. *Restructuring to promote learning in America's schools: A guidebook.* Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 379-385.

Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Klausmeier, H.J. (1990). Improving elementary and secondary schooling (the story of IGE). *The Wisconsin Center for Education Research: Twenty-five years of knowledge generation and educational improvement.* Madison: University of Wisconsin School of Education.

Kohn, A. (1991, March). Teaching children to care. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(7), 496-506.

LEAD Restructuring Study Group Select Seminar, (1989, September 30-October 2). Unpublished monograph. Leesburg, VA: Xerox Training Center.

Leithwood, K.A. (1992a). Editor's conclusion: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3*(2), 173-184.

Leithwood, K.A. (1992b). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K. & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research, 52*(3), 309-399.

Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of topological psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lezotte, L.W. & Bancroft, B.A. (1985, March). Growing use of effective schools model for school improvement. *Educational Leadership, 42*(6), 23-27.

Lieberman, A. (1977). Linking processes in educational change. In N. Nash & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts, and applications* (pp. 149-188). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of research on improving schools. *Educational Leadership, 38*(7), 583-586.

Lipham, J.M. (1977). The administrator's role in educational linkage. In N. Nash & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts, and applications* (pp. 118-148). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Little, J.W. (1981). *School success and staff development in urban segregated schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas.

Little, J.W. (1982, August-September). The effective principal. *American Education, 18*, 38-42.

Louis, K.S. & Miles, M.B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school, what works and why.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K.S., Rosenblum, S., & Molitor, J. (1981). *Strategies for knowledge use and school improvement: A summary.* (Final Report, Contract No. NIE-400-78-0002.) Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Machiavelli, N. (1984). *The prince* (P. Bandanella & M. Musa, Trans.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. (original work published 1532)

MacPhail-Wilson, B. & Guth, J. (1983). Effectiveness research and school administration — Both sides of the coin. *NASSP Bulletin, 67*(465), 3-8.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R.T., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature – A call for research. In W.H. Clune & J.F. Witte (Eds.) *Choice and control in American education, Vol. 2: The practice of choice, decentralization, and school restructuring* (pp. 289-342). London: Falmer Press.

Manasse, A.L. (1982, March). Effective principals. Effective at what? *Principal, 61*(4), 10-15.

Manasse, A.L. (1984). Principals as leaders of high-performing systems. *Educational Leadership, 41*(5), 42-46.

Manasse, A.L. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research. *The Elementary School Journal, 85*(3), 439-463.

McCurdy, J. (1983). *The role of the principal in effective schools* (AASA Critical Issue Report). Sacramento, CA: Education News Service.

McLaughlin, M.W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9*(2), 171-178.

McLaughlin, M.W. (1989). *The Rand Study ten years later: Macro realities.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

Méndez-Morse, S. (1992). *Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Mitchell, D.E. & Tucker, S. (1992, February). Leadership as a way of thinking. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 30-35.

Mojkowski, C. (1991, March). *Developing leaders for restructuring schools: New habits of mind and heart.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Mortimore, P. & Sammons, P. (1987). New evidence on effective elementary schools. *Educational Leadership, 45*(1), 4-8.

Muller, R.W. (1989). *Instructional leadership superintendent competencies related to student achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Murphy, J. (1991a). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1991b). The effects of the educational reform movement on departments of educational leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13*(1), 49-65.

Murphy, J. (1991c, February). The "Maytag Man" of school reform. *The School Administrator, 48*(2), 32-33.

Murphy, J. (1992). School effectiveness and school restructuring: Contributions to educational improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3*(2), 90-109.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1986, Summer). The superintendent as instructional leader: Findings from effective school districts. *The Journal of Educational Administration, 24*(2), 213-231.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Peterson, K.D. (1985). Supervising and evaluating principals: Lessons from effective districts. *Educational Leadership, 43*(2), 78-82.

Odden, A. (1983, January). Research findings on effective schools. ERS *Issuegram*.

Osborne, B. & Cochran, J.L. (1992, April). Total quality management and educational leadership. *OASCD Journal, 4*(1), 15-18.

Pajak, E.F. & Glickman, C.D. (1989). Dimensions of school district improvement. *Educational Leadership, 46*(8), 61-64.

Paul, D.A. (1977). Change processes at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education. In N. Nash & J. Culbertson (Eds.), *Linking processes in educational improvement: Concepts, and applications* (pp. 7-73). Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Paulu, N. (1988). *Experiences in school improvement: The story of 16 American districts.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence.* New York: Random House.

Peterson, K.D. (1984). Mechanisms of administrative control over managers in educational organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 573-597.

Peterson, K.D., Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Superintendents' perceptions of the control and coordination of the technical core in effective school districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 23*(1), 79-95.

Pipho, C. (1992, March). Sweeping the boards clean. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(7), 510-511.

Pollack, S., Chrispeels, J., Watson, D., Brice, R., & McCormack, S. (1988, April). *A description of district factors that assist in the development of equity schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Postman, N. (1982). *The disappearance of childhood.* New York: Delacorte Press.

Reavis, C. & Griffith, H. (1992). *Restructuring schools: Theory and practice.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Redding, N. (1992, May). Assessing the big outcomes. *Educational Leadership, 49*(8), 49-53.

Reinhard, D.L., Arends, R.A., Kutz, W., Lovell, K., & Wyant, S. (1980). *Great expectations: The principal's role and inservice needs in supporting change projects.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Rodgers, E. (1971). *Diffusion of innovations.* New York: The Free Press.

Russell, J.S., Mazzarella, J.A., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985, June). *Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors.* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Rutherford, W.L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(1), 31-34.

Rutherford, W.L., Hord, S.M., Huling, L., & Hall, G.E. (1983). *Change facilitators: In search of understanding their role.* Austin, TX: The University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Sagor, R.D. (1992). Three principals who make a difference. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 13-18.

Sashkin, M. & Egermeier, J. (1992). *School change models and processes: A review of research and practice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Schlechty, P.C. (1988). Leading cultural change: The CMS case. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 185-221). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schlechty, P.C. & Cole, B. (1991). Creating a system that supports change. *Educational Horizons, 69*(2), 78-82.

Seiber, S.D., Louis, K.S., & Medzker, L. (1972). *The use of educational knowledge: Evaluation of the Pilot State Dissemination Program.* New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research.

Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, P.M. & Lannon-Kim. (1991, November). Recapturing the spirit of learning through a systems approach. *The School Administrator, 48*(9), 8-13.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990a). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 23-27.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990b). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sizer, T.R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sparks, D. (1991, September). Restructuring schools through staff development: An interview with Phil Schlechty. *The Developer*, pp. 1, 5-7.

Stallings, J. & Mohlman, G. (1981). *School policy, leadership style, teacher change and student behavior in eight elementary schools*. Prepared for the National Institute of Education. Mountain View, CA: Stallings Teaching and Learning Institute.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). *Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Thomas, M. (1978). A study of alternate views. *American education: Vol. 2. The role of the principal*. Santa Monica: RAND.

Tichy, N.M. & Devanna, M.A. (1986). The transformational leader. *Training and Development Journal, 41*(7), 27-32.

Tosi, J.J., Jr. (1982). Toward a paradigm shift in the study of leadership. In J.G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership beyond establishment views* (pp. 222-233). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Venezky, R. & Winfield, L. (1979). *Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware.

Watkins, J.M., Cox, P., Owen, J.M., & Burkhardt, G. (1992). *Designing assessments for learner- and learning-centered schools*. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Wehlage, G., Smith, G., & Lipman, P. (1992). Restructuring urban schools: The new futures experience. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(1), 51-93.

Weick, K.E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63*(10), 673-676.

Wimpelberg, R.K. (1987). The dilemma of instructional leadership and a central role for central office. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 100-117). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Published by
Southwest Educational
Development Laboratory,
Services for School Improvement

SEDL | OERI

Sponsored by
Office of Educational
Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE